

---

## *Advertisement.*

**T**Here is lately Published, *A Letter of Advice to the Churches of the Nonconformists in the English Nation: Endeavouring their Satisfaction in that Point, Who are the True Church of England?*

And now in the Press.

*Short Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse (in the Conformists Cases against Dissenters) concerning a scrupulous Conscience.*

*An Examination of Dr. Hascard's Discourse concerning Satisfaction, wherein it is inquired, How well the Author of the said Discourse hath proved, That it is not lawful for a Man to go from his Parish Church to Meetings, that be might better Edifie.*

---

---

## *Advertisement.*

**T**Here is lately Published, *A Letter of Advice to the Churches of the Nonconformists in the English Nation: Endeavouring their Satisfaction in that Point, Who are the True Church of England?*

And now in the Press.

*Short Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse (in the Conformists Cases against Dissenters) concerning a scrupulous Conscience.*

*An Examination of Dr. Hascard's Discourse concerning Satisfaction, wherein it is insisted, How well the Author of the said Discourse hath proved, That it is not lawful for a Man to go from his Parish Church to Meetings, that be might better Edifie.*

---



AN  
ANSWER  
TO  
Dr. SCOT'S  
CASES

AGAINST

Dissenters

CONCERNING

Forms of Prayer.

AND

The Fallacy of the Story of *Commin*, plainly  
Discovered.

---

LONDON:

Printed for *A. Baldwin* at the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*,  
1700.

HA

A N S W E R

TO

DE SCOTTS

C A S E S

DIRECT

OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

AND

OF THE

APPENDIX

OF THE

1871

AN  
ANSWER  
TO  
Dr. SCOT's  
CASES of CONSCIENCE  
ABOUT  
Forms of Prayer.

**I**N the Question, relating to (*Forms of Prayer*) agitated of late Years betwixt Learned Divines, of several Perswasions, Three Things are considerable, which are no light Prejudices against their Opinion, who have been so Zealous for them.

1. The Difficulty of bringing them to State the Question right, or to speak closely to it, when so stated. 1. *Whether Forms of Prayer be lawful yea or no?* 2. *Whether supposing them lawful, they may be lawfully imposed on Ministers of the Gospel?* 3. *Whether (supposing they may be lawfully imposed on by some) they may be lawfully imposed universally on all Ministers, and by all Ministers used in their Publick Ministration?* 4. *Whether People may join with Ministers using them?* Are Four distinct Questions. The first of which is (that I know of) denied by none. The last, by none, or very few. The Author of the Book called, *A Reasonable Account, why some pious Nonconforming Ministers in England, Judge it sinful for them, to perform their Ministerial Acts in Publick, solemn Prayer*

er by the prescribed Forms of others. Chap. 1. Stated the Question thus.

*Whether it be lawful for Ministers (having the Gift of Prayer) ordinarily to perform their Ministerial Acts in Solemn, Stated, Publick Prayer; by reading, or reciting Forms of Prayer composed by other Men, confessedly not divinely and immediately inspired, although by Superiours required so to do?*

His Learned Answerer confesseth, That he had Stated the Question with sufficient plainness and clearness. Let that then be taken for the true Question, for we are concerned in no other.

2. A Second considerable Prejudice is, That those who have pleaded the lawfulness of the Use of Forms; have laid a great deal of more stress, upon the inartificial Arguments, drawn from Authority and Antiquity (as they have pretended) than upon any artificial Arguments drawn from the intrinsic Nature of the Action; whereas one Scriptural, or Artificial Argument is worth a Thousand others; and till the lawfulness of an Action be proved, no Argument from Authority commanding, or Antiquity, or present Usage approving, can come into any Consideration at all; it being most certain, that no Authority of Man can oblige us contrary to the Will of God, neither ought any Examples of Men to be produced, as Temptations to move us to any Thing of that Nature.

3. A Third is, Their extravagant Zeal to load the Opinions contrary to theirs, with odious Prejudices and Imputations. Three of these I have taken more special Notice of in this Case.

1. The First is great Impertinence, and Nonsense, and Rudeness to say no worse, that are sometimes mingled with extempore Prayers (So our Casuist phraseth it) Part 2. pag. 14.

2. The Possibility that fluency of Expression may be P. 2. pag 13. from Diabolical Inspiration. This our Casuist also hits upon, I do not remember any higher Authority for this, than that of Ravilliac Redivivus. Since the Notion mightily pleased Dr. Falkner, in his Vindication of Liturgies, p. 41: Ravilliac produced only the Instance of Major Weier, to prove what he said, our Casuist hath found more.

3. The Third is, That these conceived Prayers, were first brought in by Jesuits. This also our Casuist hits upon, P. 2. pa. 59, 60.

For the First of these, I do not think it worth the while to say any Thing to it, the Knowledge of the contrary, to so many Thousands in London for Twenty Years together (whiles hardly any others were publicly used) and the Experience of Two or Three and Twenty Years since, whiles the Forms have been used in Publick Temples, yet others also have been used in the hearing of many Thousands, is so eminent a Confutation of this, as nothing need be added, to say nothing of what hath been already said, that *Forms* for the Desk will not prevent this, unless we have some for the *Pulpit*, and that for *Sermons*, as well as *Prayers*, and for *Families*, &c. and that as large an Experience hath shewed, that a wandering Mind in a Minister, will expose *Forms* to the like Absurdity (of which Instances enough might be given) besides, that it is no small Imputation upon those who are intrusted to send out faithful, and able Preachers, that they send out such as cannot Pray, without *Impertinency*, *Nonsense*, and *Rudeness*, or Worse.

But the two latter have in them so much of falshood (if not something much worse) that it is necessary to vindicate, free, conceived Prayer, from such black and odious Imputations, fit for nothing; but to make some prophane Persons, matter for Discourse over a Pot of Ale, or Pint of Wine.

I will begin with the latter first, as to which our P. 59. Part 2. Casuist saith, P. 59. Par. 2. 'That we should do

'well to consider who it was that first introduced it [that is praying by conceived Prayer] into England, and set it up in Opposition to our Liturgy. For First, There was one faithful *Commin*, a *Dominican* Friar, who in the Ninth of *Elizabeth*, to seduce the People from the Church, thereby to serve the Ends of *Popery*, began to Pray *Ex tempore*, with such wonderful Zeal and Fervor, that he deluded a great many simple People, for which he was afterwards amply Rewarded by the Pope. After him one *Thomas Heath* a *Jesuit*, pursued the same Method, exclaiming against our Liturgy, and crying up *Spiritual*, or *Ex tempore* Prayers, thereby to divide the People from our Publick Worship, telling the Bishop of *Rocheſter*, by whom he was examined. That he had been Six Years in *England*, labouring to refine the *Protestants*, and to take off all Smacks of Ceremonies, and to make the Church purer &c. And I hope,

Vid. *Foxes and Firebrands*, p. 7. P. 17.

† Of which see more in the Preface of the learned *Treasure*. The unreasonableness of Separation beginning, p. 11.

'when our Brethren have well considered, who it is they join with, and whose Cause they advance, while they thus decry our Liturgy, and Cry up their own *Ex tempore* Prayers, in the Room of it; they will at last see Cause to retract a mistake, which none but the Church of *Rome* will have cause to thank them for.

The Learned Author quoted by our *Casuis*t in his *Margent*, thus expresth himself in the Place cited.

'Of this, we have a considerable Evidence lately offered to the World, in the Examination of a Priest so imployed at the Council Table, *A. D.* 1567. being the Ninth of Queen *Elizabeth*, which is Published from the Lord *Burleigh's* Papers, which were in the Hands of the Archbishop *Usher*, and from him came to Sir *James Ware*, whose Son brought them into *England*; and lately caused them to be Printed. To prove this, he quotes no more valuable Author then *Foxes* and *Firebrands*, 1680.

So that to the Author of that Reverend Pamphlet, *Foxes* and *Firebrands* we must go, and if he proves *Romantick*, all this Story is spoiled.

The Author of that Pamphlet hath this Story, *Pag.* 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. Too long for any to transcribe. I shall only make some Remarks upon it, sufficient to make it appear ridiculous enough.

1. He tells us, it was a Story which happened 1567. Ninth *Elizabeth*. And p. 14. he saith, 'It produced the Act for preventing *Popery*, and other Sects, which enjoined all People from Ten Years old, and upward, not having a lawful Impediment, to repair every Sunday, to hear Divine Service under the Penalty of forfeiting Twelve Pence for every such default. Whereas First, There was never any such Act, as took Notice of Persons *Ten Tears Old*. Secondly, For the *Twelve Penny Act*, it concerns none under Sixteen Years of Age, and was made first *Elizabeth*, which was Eight Years before, (surely the Worthy Author read first *Elizabeth*, *decimo Elizabeth*) was not this think we a very judicious Author fit to have his Word taken? How this falshood could escape the Eyes of the Learned *Dean*, that thought fit to give such a Paltry Pamphlet Credit I cannot but admire; but we shall find more than this to defame this *Romance* by.

2. He tells us the Story was transmitted (being an extract out of the Memorials of my Lord *Burleigh*, to Bishop *Usher*) from his Papers to Sir *James Ware*, from him to *Robert Ware* Esquire his Son. So then, here are *Papers*, which in their Original are pretended



tended to be but *Extracts* (by we know not whom) these *Extracts*, are 116 Years Old (wrote in Paper) never that we heard of discovered by Bishop *Usher* all his Life Time, but coming, none knows how, or when, to Sir *James Ware*, (who is not said to be the *Bishops Executor*) neither did Sir *James* communicate them, but Dies. At length, 'tis pretended one Mr. *Robert Ware* his Son, hath obliged the World, not by Publishing them himself, but by communicating them to the *Author* of *Foxes* and *Firebrands* (in whose Hands, Papers of that Nature whatever they got, were like to loose nothing) thus the World comes to be blessed with them; and I presume this Story, deserves just as much Credit as the *Catholick Letter*, Published a little after this, the Forgery of which was detected by *Parliament*, and the *Author* cried *Peccavi* for it. Surely, if we were not very partial in our Judgments, upon *Relations* and *Stories*, that favour our own Opinions, and Fancies it were hardly possible any Learned Man could call this a *considerable Evidence*, which hath nothing of an *Evidence* in it. Here is a *Paper Evidence*, that is, but a pretended *Abstract*, and that of a *Relation* of Matter of Fact more than a hundred Years Old (it were worth something to see it) and this communicated to the World, after I know not how many Descents. My Lord *Burleighs*, the *Primates*, Sir *James Ware*, and at last at the Second Hand, not by him that had this *Relick*, but by one who hath not given the World much Cause to be confident of the Truth of what he hath wrote. And as it will appear by what followeth, hath no more deserved any Credit from the World for this Story, (which will appear, if not a *Romance*, yet to have such Marks of one, as any one upon an *Hue and Cry* would) see Reason to stop it upon Suspicion, as such.

3. In the first Place, he saith, *Faithful* Commin was a Friar of the Order of St. Dominick. This encouraged the *Dean* of Pauls to call him a *Priest*, and our *Casuis*t to call him a *Dominican Friar*; but how doth this appear from any Part of the Story, as related at large in the *Pamphlet*? He confessed no such thing, all that he said, was, that he was of *Christs Order*, a *Preacher* of the *Holy Gospel*. No such thing was proved against him. *Clerkson* (the *Arch-Bishops Chaplain*) saith, he fell from the Church of Rome, and puts him to prove his *Ordination*; objects, that he never came to our *Liturgy*, nor received the *Sacrament* from any of our *Orthodox Clergy-men*. *Draper* the Cook and his *Maid* witnessed nothing, but their hearing of him Pray two Hours in his Private Chamber.

Nei.

Neither doth *Baker* the Ship-master prove any such thing, he only tells the Council of a Story that one *Martin Dival*, should tell him, of which this was no Part. Possibly he had been a *Dominican Friar*, but that he was so now, appeareth from nothing in the whole Story, and there is no doubt but in the Ninth of *Elizabeth*, there were some hundreds of *Dominican Friars*, that were *Protestants*; for it was but Nine Years after the generality of the Nation had been *Papists*. So as all that should have been said (if so much could) was, that this *Faithful Commion* (who formerly had been a *Dominican Friar*) was accused by *John Clerkson* (Chaplain to Archbishop *Parker*) *Nicholas Draper*, and *Mary Dean* a Maid Servant.

4. They Deposed (as is said) upon their Oath. What? That the said *Faithful Commion*, was no true *Protestant*, but a false Impostor, a Sower of Sedition among Her Majesties Loyal Subjects. This is a pretty Strange Oath, as if one should go and depose before a Justice of the Peace, that *A. B.* is no *Honest-man*, but a Thief, a Murderer, &c. I wonder what Judge or Justice of Peace would Convent any upon such an Oath? Yet we are made believe (not very probably) that upon this he was Convented, Munday April 5. before the *Queen* and the Council, where Archbishop *Parker* examined him. I hope upon his Examination, something will appear further.

5: The Archbishop (as is said) asked him, Of what Profession he was? He replieth, Of *Christs Order*. The Archbishop asks him, What Order was that? He replieth, A Preacher of the Holy Gospel. The Archbishop asks him, What Gospel be call'd the Holy Gospel? He replies, The Gospel of *Jesus Christ*. The Archbishop asks, Under what Power do you own to hold that Gospel? He replieth, Under *Christ* and his Saints. The Archbishop asks, Do you acknowledge any other Power save that of *Christ* to be on the Earth? He replies, Yes I do. Archbishop saith, What is that? He replies, The Holy Catholick Church. The Archbishop saith, Do you not acknowledge, a Defender of the Holy Catholick Faith? He replieth, God is the only Defender. Then the Archbishop tells the *Queen*, he was instructed, or else was a Man of Craft. I would now gladly know, what upon all this his first Examination, spake him a *Papist*. His Answers are as like the Answers of some simple, weak *Noncon*, as is imaginable. Neither doth the Archbishops Questions argue his Suspicion of him to be a *Papist*. He doth not so much as ask him, what Religion he owned, nor propound any Question to him about any  
distin-



distinctive Point of Popery. Nor do the *Archbishops* Questions sound like Questions indeed, propounded by a Man of *Archbishop Parker's* Learning, who would hardly have phrased his Questions so.

1. Under what Power do you own to hold [ certainly he would have said to preach ] the Gospel.

2. Do you acknowledge any other Power, save Christ on the Earth?

Those who formed these Questions, seem to be some Persons short of the Learning and Judgment of *Archbishop Parker*.

After this, the Author of *Foxes and Firebrands* tells us, that *Commin* was ordered to withdraw, then the Witnesses were called, of which *John Clerkson* ( the *Archbishops* Chaplain ) was the first, who told the Queen he had been acquainted with *Commin* for a Year before past. The Queen asked him, What he had to say against *F. Commyn*, that he suspected him to be an Impostor? He Answers Three Things.

1. Let him ( saith he ) prove his Ordination, since he fell from the Church of Rome.

2. Why he never cometh to the Prayers of the now established Church of England.

3. Let him prove, that ever he received the Sacrament according to the Church of England, from any of our Orthodox Clergy-men.

6. This is all so *Romantick*, as hardly any thing can be more; I suppose the Accuser after an Oath taken, ought to have averred before so great a Presence, not to have said, Let him prove. At this rate the Council might have sent for, and Charged every Subject the Queen had, was it ever before heard, that an Accuser charged with an Oath, to speak the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth, should begin his Deposition with, Let him prove. How must the Entry of this be? This Deponent being sworn and examined, saith, Let him prove his Ordination, since he fell from the Church of Rome, &c. My Lord *Barleights* Clerks knew better how to draw a Deposition sure. 2. But besides, what should *Commin* prove? That, which none in England ( being a Priest of the Church of Rome before ) was ever required to prove, nor ever had, viz. a Second Ordination, after his Conversion from the *Romish Religion*.

The Author goeth on telling us, that after some Consideration, he was called in again and asked, Whether he was ever ordained, and by whom? *Commin* saith he was, and by the Cardinal *Pool*, ( who was dead nine Years before this ) the *Archbishop* asks, If he

be had not any other Certificate under the Bishops Hands since the Reformation? He saith, not any. The Archbishop asks him, Wherefore he would dare to Preach, having not got a License of Permission, under some of our Bishops hands, how shall we be assured you are not of the Romish Church? *Commin* Answers, There are several have heard my Prayers, and my Sermons, and can testifie that I have spoken against Rome, and her Pope, as much as any of the Clergy have, since they have fallen from Her, I wonder therefore, why I should be suspected.

7. So certainly might any one else wonder, till they had proved some Popish Tenets broached by him, and either publicly Preached, or secretly Whispered. The Archbishops Question too was admirable, how should his Purchase of a License to preach, have secured them that he was no Papist. Though he had taken the Oath of Supremacy, he might have vomited it up, both Bonner and Gardiner had done as much.

But the Archbishop is made to go on thus. By your Answer *M<sup>r</sup>. Commin*, I perceive you would have any one Preach, so that he speak but against the Pope in his Sermons. *Commin* is made to Reply, not every one, but he whose Function it is, and who hath the Spirit of Grace and Truth. The Archbishop replieth, But is this Spirit that is in you, either the Spirit of Grace, or Truth, that doth not comply with the Orders of the Church, lately purged from Schism and Idolatry?

8. This Question now proceeds upon this Hypothesis. That a particular Church lately purged from Schism and Idolatry, can make no Order, that cannot by all be lawfully complied with (that is, cannot err) which is directly contrary to our Thirty Nine Articles, and not like to have been the Speech of so Learned and Judicious a Person, as Archbishop Parker was.

But to proceed, *Commin* is brought in replying to the Archbishop. Therefore I endeavour to make it purer, as far as God permits. The Archbishop asks, How do you endeavour to make the Church purer, when you neither communicate with Her in Sacraments, or in Prayer? To which *Commin* Answers, Tes, I endeavour, if when I Pray to God, that he would open the Eyes of Men to see their Errors, and several have joined with me, when I have prayed among them, and I have both given, and taken the Body of Christ to those of tender Consciences, who have assembled with me in the fear of the Lord. The Archbishop replies, By your Words then, you have a Congregation that follows you. *Commin* replies, I have. The Archbishop asks, Of what Parish, and in what Diocese? He replies, neither in any certain Parish, nor in any certain Diocese. The Archbishop replies, Where then

*I Pray?* He replies, *In the wide World among the flock of Christ, scattered over the whole Earth.* The Queen replies, *Your Diocese is very large Mr. Commin.*

9. I would gladly know of any, who understand Sense, what there is in all this, to prove this *Commin* was a *Papist*.

After this two other Witnesses were examined, one *Draper*, and *Mary Dean* his Maid.

*Draper*, saith, 'That *Commin*, came to his House at the *Maid-en-head*, with several of his Followers, where he bespoke a Joint 'of *Mutton*, and Two *Hens* for his Dinner, hearing that his Pro- 'fession was a Cook, that he shewed him a Room, for him and 'the Company that came with him, perceiving several to come 'and inquire for him. That by Chance going up to the Stairs, 'he heard one Groan and Weep, which caused him to lift up the 'Latch, at first he was startled and stood amazed, but inquiring 'of one of his Followers, what ailed the Man; he replied, *Do ye not see we be all at Prayers?* The Maid (saith he) wondering 'where I was, came to seek me, and found me amongst them, and 'can testify the same. The Maid (*Mary Dean*) testified the 'same, adding, that she thought he was Distracted, when she 'heard him Pray; but the People said, he was an heavenly Man, 'and that it was Gods Spirit made him weep for the Sins of the 'World. *Draper* added, That he continued about two Hours in 'Prayer, then some went away, about Ten staid, and did eat what 'they had spoken for, and paid him to the utmost Penny.

What was there now in all this, to prove *Faithful Commin* a *Popish Priest*? Was it his Praying two Hours? Here is nothing else evidenced against him, yet this was the whole Proof, as recited by the Author of *Foxes and Firebrands*. But it may be, we shall meet with something afterward, more Effectual. Let us therefore proceed with the Story.

The aforesaid Author tells us, that after this the *Queen* caused *Commin* to be called in, and told him that, *If he would receive Orders, and become of the Church of England, he might; otherwise he must not be permitted to Pray and Preach among Her Subjects.* How improbable a Story this is, may be understood by any that understand, that according to our *English Discipline*, none once ordained by the Church of *Rome* is to be *reordained*; and it is not likely the *Queen* would have put him more upon a *Reordination*, than a *Rebaptization*. His fault apparently was, a *Preaching without License*, and so much is imported by the *Queens* next Words (if ever they were Hers.)

They have usurped over the Power both of Church, and of State, in doing contrary to the Order, that We, our Council, and Parliament have agreed on unanimously, by, and with the Consent of the whole Clergy of my Realm.

*Commin* (as the Tale is told) desires Time to give the *Queen* an Answer. The *Queen* requires Bond for his Appearance, pretending other Examinations to be taken, and Questions to be propounded.

How *Preaching without Licence*, and *Praying Two Hours in an Inn*, came to be a Council-Board Case, deserveth thinking-Mens Deliberation; for here is nothing else either confessed by him, or objected, or proved against him; but not coming to the Prayers, and not receiving the Sacrament, for both which, the Statute, and Ecclesiastical Law was plain enough; and in Cases where the Law hath provided, the Council-Board useth not to concern themselves.

The upshot of the Story is, that one *Bland*, and Twenty others were *Commin's* Security, for his Appearance again at the Council-Table, 12 April, 1567.

When they did appear, but were put off till the next Day. When (as the Tale is told) *Commin* did not appear, his Bail was sent for, but they were discharged, being bound only for his Appearance 12 April, when he did appear.

*Commin*, if we may believe the Author of *Foxes* and *Firebrands*, went away that Evening, April 12.

The same Author tells us, p. 12. 'That *Commin* coming from the Council, told his Followers, that Her Majesty, and the Council had acquitted him, and that he was warned of God to go beyond the Sea, to instruct the Protestants there, and that ere long he would return to his Flock, with better Success. He told them, that Spiritual Prayer was the chief Testimony of a true Protestant, and that the sett Form in England, was but the Mass Translated. So after he had with a Multitude of Tears like a Crocodile, first prayed an *Ex tempore* Prayer, the better to prey upon the poor deluded People; he took his leave of them, telling he had not one Farthing to support him in his Journey, yet being Gods Cause, he would undertake it out of Charity; and he was assured that the Lord would raise him up Friends where ever he travelled. This Speech set most of the People on Weeping, especially the Women, who requested their Husbands to contribute towards his Necessities, and it was made appear af-

after his escape out of *England*, that they Collected for him 130 l. besides what the compassionate Sex bestowed upon him unknown to their Husbands.

All this now is either True or False, if it be all a Forgery, and of the same Batch that the Letter which came out a little before this Pamphlet from the Jesuit in Paris, to his Correspondent in London, shewing the most Effectual Way to ruine the Government, and Protestant Religion (complain'd of in Parliament, March 21<sup>st</sup>. 78. which the House of Commons was informed, one Dr. Nelson was the Forger of, March 26. 1679. and upon it, that Day ordered him into Custody, and for which he had upon his Knees a Reprimand, May 2. 1679.) it signifies nothing. If any think it was true, he should do well to consider, how the Author of *Foxes* and *Firebrands*, should know it to be so. It is a Passage 116 Years Old, and not likely (as any will say that ever saw any Minutes of the Council-Board) to be all entred there, or so taken by the Secretary Cecil, as to be so whole in his Papers. It was not the product of any judicial Examination, few I think will be so credulous as to believe such Romances. Let us yet go on with the Story, in the latter Part of which (if any where) must be the Proof of *Commin's* being a Popish Priest.

The Author of the Book aforesaid, tells us, there was no further Account of *Commin*, till the 14. Sept. which was just five Months, and no more from *Commin* going away. Then, One Baker, a Shipmaster arrived at *Portsmouth*, and told (we know not who) that he had seen *Commin* in the Low Countries, and that coming to unlade some Goods at *Amsterdam*, one *Martin Van Daval*, a Merchant of that City, hearing him talk of the said *Commin*; told him, that this Faithful *Commin*, had been lately at *Rome*, and that the Pope *Pius Quintus* had put him in Prison, but that *Commin* writing to the Pope, that he had something of Importance to communicate to him, the Pope sent for him the next Day, and as soon as he saw him said. Sir, I have heard how you have set forth me, and my Predecessors among your Hereticks in *England*, by reviling my Person, and railing at my Church: To whom *Commin* replied, I confess my Lips have uttered that which my Heart never Thought, but your Holiness little thinks, I have done you a most considerable Service, notwithstanding I have spoken so much against you. To which the Pope returned, How in the Name of *Jesus*, *Mary*, and all the Saints hast thou done so? Sir (said *Commin*) I Preached a-

*Letter of Queen sent for him.*



'gainst set Forms of Prayer, and I called the *English Prayers*, *English Mass*, and have perswaded several to pray spiritually, and *Ex tempore*, and this hath so much taken with the People, that the Church of *England* is become as odious to that sort of People, whom I instructed, as *Mass* is to the Church of *England*, and this will be a stumbling block to that Church, while it is a Church; upon which the Pope commended him, and gave him a Reward of Two Thousand Ducats for his good Service.

*Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua Carmina Mævi.*

Let those whom a *Romance*, or notorious Forgery will tickle, be pleased with this most inartificial One, which hath as many Brands of such a thing, as it is almost possible a Story should have.

1. *First*, Here is but *five Months* allowed for one to go in to *Rome*; be there taken Notice of, Imprisoned in the Inquisition, delivered, to come back into *Holland*, for a Merchant in *Holland* to be informed of all these Transactions; to tell them to a Ship-master unloading Goods, for him again to load his Ship, to come to *Portsmouth*, from thence to *London*, and be Examined before the *Council*; which makes it alone much like the Story of him that shot the *Deer* through his *Claw*, and *Right Ear* at the same shot, which might be true, but not very easie to be credited by any thinking Man.

2. Here are *set, formal Speeches* reported betwixt the *Pope* and *Commin*, upon his Private Discourse with the *Pope*, which none could know, or relate, unless they wrote the Words in Characters (a thing not so usual in *Rome*) and upon the Truth of these Words of *Commin* to the *Pope*, lies all the Stress of the Matter for which this Story is brought. This is so bare-faced a piece of Fiction, as any Man of ordinary Modesty would blush at.

3. Here are Forms of Speech used, not very likely to be used, either by a beggerly *Priest* to a *Pope*, or by a *Pope* unto him; it would also be inquired, Whether *Pius Quintus* used that Phrase ordinarily, *In the Name of Jesus, Mary, and all the Saints*?

4. It is not very probable, that he being committed for so high a Crime, as railing at the *Pope* or the *Church* of *Rome*, should be so soon discharged, upon writing a *Lie*; all know in such Cases there use to be *Petitions* upon *Petitions*, nor is the *Pope* so much at leisure, as to send for a Prisoner the next Day.

5. What

5. What Evidence had the *Pope* of the *Feats Commin* had done; did he take his own Word (think we) for the good Service he had done, so as to acquit him of such a Crime?

6. All I can say is, If the *Pope* gave him 2000 Ducats upon these Terms, *Pius Quintus* and his Money were sooner parted, than I think any reasonable Man will believe they should.

I Appeal to the Judgment of the whole World, whether this Story hath any thing of credibility in it.

The next Story brought to perswade us, *That free, spiritual Prayer was brought in by the Jesuits and Romish Priests* is the Story of one *Heath*, related largely by the aforesaid Author of the Pamphlet called *Foxes*, and *Firebrands*, out of a pretended Registry of the Episcopal See of *Rocheſter*, which begins Anno 2. & 3. Phil. & Mar. and continued to the 15th Elizabeth. The Passage which makes up the Story, he saith was 11. Eliz. he tells us the Story at large, p. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. Dr. St. mentions it in his Preface to his *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 13, 14. Our *Cassius* hath it again, Part 2. p. 60. I shall not trouble my Reader with the History at large, which may be read by any that are curious in the afore-mentioned Pamphlet called *Foxes* and *Firebrands*.

All in it which looks towards our Purpose is, that this *Heath* confessed, that he had been a *Jesuit* Six Years before, viz. Anno 1562. but owned himself at that Time a *Protestant*, and accordingly applied himself to the *Dean of Rocheſter* (his Brother having been lately Bishop of that See) for some Church preferment, and had encouragement, only the *Dean* would first hear him Preach, and appointed him, 21. Nov. when he Preached, and that in the Cathedral upon *Acts* 12. 6. *Peter therefore was kept in Prison, but Prayers were made without ceasing to God for him.* It seemeth, this subtle *Jesuit* was so simple, as in a Probation Sermon to tell the *Dean*, and his other Hearers. *That they were not the Prayers of the Church of England as then established, that brought Peter out of Prison, but spiritual Prayers.*

The *Sexton* (as the Story goes) after Sermon found a Letter in the Pulpit, directed to one Mr. *Thomas Thinn*, he carrieth it to the Bishop, and it was as followeth

*Finne y<sup>e</sup> Dran do  
it*

Brother,  
The Council of our Fraternity, have thought fit to send you David George, Theodorus Sarter, and John Huits, their Colleagues, which you may distribute where ever you see it may be for

for your Purpose, according to the Peoples Inclinations; these mixtures with your own, will not only puzzle the Understandings of your Auditors, but make your self Famous. We suppose your wants are not considerable at present, by what we have heard, how your Flock do admire you every Day, more, and more. Be not over zealous in your Proceedings in the beginning, but gradually win on them, as you visit them; and according as you find their Inclinations bend to your Design. Let us hear how you have proceeded, for it will satisfy our Brethren much, and enable them to instruct you for the Future; *Hallingam, Coleman, and Benson* have set a Faction amongst the *German Hereticks*, so as several, who have turned from us, have denied their Baptism, which we hope will soon turn the Scale, and bring them back, to their old Principles. This we have certified to the Council, and Cardinals. That there is no other way to prevent People from turning *Hereticks*, and for recalling others back again to the Mother Church, then by Diversity of Doctrines; we wish you to Prosper.

Madrid, Oct.  
26, 1658.

Samuel Malt.

Upon this Letter thus found, the *Bishop of Rochester* Convent-ed the Preacher, Nov. 22. chargeth him with nothing, but a Suspicion that he was a *Jesuit*, and that this Letter came indeed to him, though under the Fictitious Name of *Thomas Tbin*. If we may believe the Story he confessed, that he had been a *Jesuit* Six Years before, 1562. but saith, that he had for Six Years before, past, withdrawn from them. The *Bishop* (to prove him a *Jesuit* still) urged his Saying in his Sermon the Day before. That they were not the Prayers of the Church of England, but spiritual Prayers, that brought Peter out of Prison (and was not this a concludent Argument that he was a *Jesuit*?) And by and by, the *Bishop* asks him, if he had no Letters from those of his own Order? If he knew one *Malt*, sheweth him the Letter supposed to be by him dropped in the Pulpit. He owned, that he had heard of *Malt*, and perhaps had formerly known him, but would not own that he yet was a *Papist*. But it is said, that upon search at his Inn (for he had been in Town but Three Weeks) his Beads were found in his Boots, and amongst his Papers, a License from the Fraternity of the *Jesuits*, and a Bull dated the first of *Pius Quintus* (which by the way was that Year) To Preach what Doctrines that Society pleased, for dividing Pro-  
testants,



testants, and in his Trunk were found several Books denying Infant Baptism. Upon which it is said, the Bishop adjourned the Court Three Days, to the 25. Nov. and in the mean time sent to the Council for Instructions. Upon 25. Nov. he remanded him to Prison, Sentenced him to stand in the Pillory Three Days, and on the Third Day to have his Ears cut off, his Nose slit, his Fore-head branded with F. and to be perpetually Imprisoned. This is the Story.

Admit, now it were true in all Points, I see nothing in it, that either makes against free, conceived, Prayer, or against Dissenters. Who doubteth but that Jesuites will turn themselves into all Shapes, this very Jesuit was a Probationer for a Son of the Church; he Preached before the Dean for that Purpose. One of them may be all for the Prayers of the Church, and for the heighths of Ceremonies (as we know Popish Priests are generally.) Another of them may be for conceived Prayer, and exclaim against the Ceremonies, when both the one, and the other, drive the same Design, that they may rule. Now had we no Liturgy universally imposed, nor any Ceremonies so imposed, their Designs were spoiled, and they would be put to new Topicks. I never thought the good Angels in the least defamed, by the Devils transforming themselves into their Appearance.

Bnt this Story as related by the Author of Foxes, and Fire-brands, hath as great Appearances also of a Forgery, as can well be imagined.

1. It comes to us only upon the Credit of a Registry, and concerneth a Matter of Fact 115 Years since, is justified by no Print; though both Holinshead and Camden wrote the History of Queen Elizabeth's Reign with great Particularities. Now we know the Authority of an Ecclesiastical Court, is such, as none of our Civil Courts will admit their Scripts for Records.

2. We know there was for Twenty Years an Interruption of those Registrings, in which Time they lost many of their Books and Papers, this must be supposed to have escaped the common Fate.

3. The Register must be presumed to have made a true Entry, and that Verbatim, of what the Bishop said, and Heath answered. Those who have been acquainted with those Courts will tell us, they could never find a true Entry made, of what was said between the Judges and Parties questioned, when they have looked for them within Fourteen Days or a Month.

4. This Examination was in Court. Registers use not in Court to set down Questions and Answers at large, but to make *Minutes* of them, and then extend them at their Leisure; so as this Examination was probably set down when the Court was done, as Mr. *Register's* Memory would serve him, and it was for the Interest of the Church to set down, so as we cannot be assured that so much as one *Question* with the Answer to it, is truly set down.

5. By what Authority did the Bishop Sentence him to the Pillory, to have his Ears cut off, his Nose slit, and to suffer perpetual Imprisonment? And for what Crime? All the World knows, that since the Reformation, no *Bishop* ever had such a Power. The *High Commission*, and *Star-chamber*, in latter Years exercised some such Power, but this was in the *Bishops Consistorial Court*, which never had such a Power.

6. It is neither probable, that a *Jesuit* should put his Beads into his Boots, nor keep a Letter (of no more Moment) in his Pocket to drop in a Cathedral Pulpit.

7. The having of *Popish* Beads, or Books denying Baptism, or speaking such Words, was by no Law a Crime, subjecting a Person to so severe a Punishment.

8. In the Year, 1536. (but Thirty Two Years before) there were not Ten *Jesuites* in the World. In the Year, 1540. (but Twenty Eight Years before) Pope *Paul* increased them to *Sixty*. In the Year, 1543. (but Twenty five Years before) he established them without Limitation. In the Year, 1541. (but Twenty seven Years before this Year) Their Colledge at the importunity of *Peter Mascarenhaz* (the *Portugal* Ambassadour to the Pope) could afford but Two (and those were Two of the first Twelve) *Xavierus*, and *Rodericus* for all *Portugal*. This Story happening within Twenty seven Years, supposeth them a formed Body, with settled Correspondencies, so as there was a Communication fixed betwixt *Rome*, *Madrid*, and *England*. The probability of which I leave to my Readers Judgment.

9. Whereas Common Fame speaks the *Jesuites* the most subtle of all Orders. This Narrative, speaks their *Fathers* (for so all their *Missionaries* are) the veryest Coxcombs in Nature. Otherwise *Heath* would never at first have owned himself a *Jesuit*, 1562. muchless would he, preaching a *Probation Sermon*, and that in a *Cathedral*, have so sillily reflected on the Prayers of the Church, or told the Bishop. That he had laboured to refine the Protestants, and to take off all smaks of Ceremonies. The poor *Jesuit* is made here beneath a tolerable Fool.

10. Nor was the Jesuit *Malt* made less. Whereas the *Anabaptists* had been once up in *Germany*, 1524. and finally quelled upon their after-rising in the Years, 1534, 1535. *Malt* the Jesuit is here brought in, endeavouring to perswade his Friend, that *Hallingam*, *Coleman*, and *Benson*, Thirty one Years after, and 1568. had raised this Faction. Was not this a great *Blackhead*, think we for a *Jesuite*?

These Difficulties (as to Credibility) this Story laboureth under, how much soever it pleased the *Dean of Pauls*, or now pleaseth our *Casnist*.

I am aware of what the *Dean* hath further said to strengthen this Story, and to evince the suitableness of these pretences about *spiritual Prayer* (as he calls them) to the Doctrine, and Practice of the *Jesuites*; but he hath received an unanswerable Answer by the Learned Author of the Book called. *A Modest and Peaceable Enquiry into the Design and Nature of those Historical Mistakes that are found in Dr. Stillingfleets Preface to his Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 7, 8, 9. where is proved.

1. 'That the *Jesuites* were not the first Inventors, nor the first 'bringers in of *spiritual Prayer*; *spiritual Prayer*, being owned, 'acknowledged, and privately practised ever since the Apostles 'Days; for the Church never did forbid the use of it, saith *Filicinus*.

2. 'That the *Jesuites* ever have, and still do zealously oppose 'the use of Free Prayer.

3. 'That wherein the *Jesuites* and the *Dissenters* agree, as to 'this, it is in no other respect, than wherein the Universal Church 'agree with them.

4. 'That wherein the *Dissenters*, and the Doctor differ about '*spiritual Prayer*, the Dr. closeth with the *Jesuit*; our difference if 'any, being about the *Publick Use of Free Prayer*, against which 'the *Jesuites* are. See these Four Things made good in the Book 'before-mentioned, p. 6, 7, 8.

But methinks, the *Dean*, and those other Divines we have to do with in this Controversie, if they have a mind to make People a little Sport, about this grave business of *Prayer*, in the Use of Mens own Abilities, they should give it another Name than that of *spiritual Prayer*. Prayer is then *spiritual*, when it is so with respect to the *Matter*, being such Things as the Holy Spirit in the Word, hath directed us to Pray for. Or as to the *Manner*, when it is the Action of our inward *Man*, not the outward

only, not a meer Lip labour, and so it is opposed to what is meerly *Verbal*. Or else, when it is attended with *Holy, and spiritual Affections* excited, and inflamed by the Holy Spirit. I am sure all other Prayer is an Abomination in the sight of God.

All the Question is, betwixt our Brethren and us, whether the Words we use in Prayer, should not be first formed in our own Hearts, and whether that Prayer which is such, be not more spiritual than other. That is, 1. Whether there be not more of the Work of our own Spirit in it (which I think no modest Man will deny?) 2. Whether there be not in such Prayer more room left to the Spirit of God to bring to our Remembrance what we have to confess, to supplicate and give Thanks for?

No Words diminutive of *spiritual Prayer*, become a Divine who ought to know, that *God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in Spirit and in Truth*.

What, if some *Jesuites* have discoursed for this kind of Prayer under the Name of *Oratio acquisita*, acquired Prayer? So they have discoursed very well, for the Divine Nature of Christ, the Trinity, the Love of God, &c. All Sober Divines will grant, that this *acquired Prayer*, is the most perfect Prayer. The *Jesuites* never discoursed for it, but in Private. They agree with some others that are no *Dissenters*, as to Publick Prayer. There was a Time, when many can bear both the *Dean*, and our late *Casnist* Witness, that they both approved, and practised this kind of Praying; if they see better now, they must Pardon others, that cannot see by their Spectacles; still *acquired Prayer*, or *free Prayer*, is what it was in the same Degree of Goodness, and Preference. I know nothing that *Spiritual Prayer* can be opposed to, but either *carnal*, or meer *formal Prayer*, from both which the good Lord deliver the whole Generation of those that seek his Face. But this is enough to deliver *free*, or *conceived*, or *acquired*, or (if they will have it so) *spiritual Prayer*; from the false and sordid Calumny of being brought in by *Jesuites*.

3. The Third is yet worse. That the Devil may have a *Causation* in it. The first that I remember I have met with, who hath taught the World this new Imputation, was the Author of *Ravillac Redivivus* proving it from the Instance of that *prodigious Hypocrite* in Scotland, *Major Weir*. The next that approved his saying was Dr. *Falkner* in his *Vindication* of Liturgies, p. 41. who speaking, how the faculty of Expression in Prayer may be procured, saith, *It may be procured, as he hath read in some particular Instances,*

ces, by Diabolical Contratts. What his Answerer replieth to him, see p. 43, 44, 45. Our Casuist hath improved the Notion, Part 2. page 13.

But then Secondly, As for Diabolical Inspirations, of Matter and Words in Prayer, we have sundry very probable Instances; such as Major *Weier* (who is said to have received his Inspirations through a Staff) *Hacket*, *David George*, and that Monster of Wickedness *John Basilides* Duke of *Russia*, who were all of them possessed with such a wonderful Gift of Prayer, as did not only charm, and ravish those that heard them, but seemed in the Opinion of the most wise and impartial to exceed the Power of Nature, which renders it very probable, that the Matter of their Prayers was for the most part agreeable to Scripture; otherwise it is hardly conceivable, how they could have procured to themselves so many Admirers, and abused so many honest Minds into a belief, that they were immediately inspired by God.

For Answer to our Casuist, his probable Instances of the Devil, his inspiring ill Men with Matter and Words in Prayer; I shall only desire the Reader to consider these few Things following.

First, Consider, That it is worth the observing, how unreasonable this Casuist, and his Liturgical Brethren are, while they find a Difficulty to allow the Holy Spirit (who is called, *The Spirit of Grace and Supplication*, Zech. 12. 10. *The Spirit of Adoption*, by which we cry *Abba*, Father, Rom. 8. 15. Gal. 4. 6. *The Spirit that helpeth our Infirmities*, because of our Selves, we know not what we should Pray for, as we ought, Rom. 8. 26.) any influence on our Words in Prayer, which is a good and Holy Action; and yet find no difficulty to yield the evil Spirit, such an influence, who abhorreth Prayer, and will leave the Room, where he is molesting Men, when they go to Prayer, as we are assured in good Histories of such Molestations by the Devil, such as that of the Devil of *Mascon*, Published by Dr. *Peter du Moulin*, and others: Is not this very unfair dealing, and an horrible Derogation from the Dignity, and blessed influences of the Holy Spirit?

Secondly, Consider, That as for us, we freely grant the possibility of all that our Casuist and his Brethren can reasonably demand, and rightly infer from the foregoing Instances. That is, we grant it is possible that by Gods Holy Permission, Satan may suggest many Things to ill Men, he may represent various Objects to the Imagination and inward Sense; he can impress the ideas of Objects



upon Mens Fancy and Imagination; and by means of those ideas, he can raise their Passions, and excite their Lusts and corrupt Affections: He cannot only imprint new Ideas upon their Imagination, but he can also revive in them the Memory of Things past, and restore to them the Ideas of Things which they had forgotten, and seemed to have lost; and by the one, or the other, or by both these Means he can influence their corrupt Affections, and put them into Motion. These are his venomous Darts, wherewith he agitates their Blood and Spirits, and fixes their Lusts and Passions. He can also suggest to them Thoughts, that it is Gods good Spirit who thus moves them, and makes those Impressions upon them; and then their own wicked Hearts, inclining them too readily to believe the Truth of his Suggestions, because of the agreeableness of some of the things suggested, to the Vanity of their Minds, out of the abundance of their Hearts, their Mouths naturally speak, and that with such defining and flourish of Words, as bears Proportion to the natural volubility of their Tongues, or to that readiness of Speech, which by Use and Exercise they have acquired. Thus it is granted, that without bodily Possession, the evil Spirit might Work in those Children of Disobedience (*Ephes. 2. 2.*) and so doing, might furnish them with Matter of Discourse, and thereby so excite and inflame their corrupt Affections and Passions, that their wicked Hearts so warmed, should readily prepare Words for their Tongues to utter, by a natural or acquired volubility of Speech. But now,

*Thirdly*, Consider, That in all this, there is nothing of that truly, spiritual, vocal Prayer, which is the proper and genuine Effect of Gods Holy Spirit, influencing the Souls of true penitent Believers. For that vocal Prayer, as such, consists of gracious Words proceeding from, and reverently, and aptly expressing the inward workings of Grace, the gracious devout Affections of the Heart, and the Holy and humble Desires of the Soul towards God through Christ. But the Words spoken from the aforesaid wretched Men, were no such gracious Words; they proceeded from no such Good, and so were expressive of no such gracious Affections, of no such holy and humbly Desires. The utmost that with any colour of Reason can be said, is, that they were the Counterfeit, and had the Semblance and Appearance of so good a thing. But then,

*Fourthly*, Let it be considered, That the Devils, and wicked Mens counterfeiting the Inspirations of the Spirit of God, and the spiritual Prayers of good Men, is so far from being an Argument  
against

against the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and against the spiritual Prayers of good Men influenced by the Holy Spirit of Prayer; that it is rather an Argument for them: Just as there having been so many false and counterfeit Miracles in the World, is an Argument that there really have been true Miracles; and as there having been so much counterfeit Coin in England, is a good Argument that there hath been, and there is in it, true and good Coin. For if there had never been any thing of that Nature, true and good; Devils and ill Men would never have been at the Pains, to make their Counterfeits.

*Fifthly*, Consider, That what ever might be the Design of the Devil in being the Author of such counterfeit delusive Inspirations, (which to be sure was no good one,) and what ever also might be the Design of our Casuist in objecting against us such counterfeit delusive Inspirations; yet certain it is, that in Truth and Reality, it is no Reproach to the Holy Spirit of God, that he suffers the Devil and his Instruments to counterfeit his Holy Inspirations; no more, than it is a Reproach to Gods Holy Angels, and faithful Ministers, that Satan transforms himself into an Angel of Light, and that Satans Ministers also are transformed into the Ministers of Righteousness, 2 Cor. 11: 14, 15.

Consider, *Sixthly*, That the right Use which Men fearing God, should make of the Instances of Diabolical Inspirations before-mentioned, is not to reject the true Influences of the Holy Spirit in Prayer; for fear of being imposed upon by the counterfeit Inspirations of Satan (that would be as wise a Course, as to throw away all Money good and bad, for fear of being cheated with counterfeit Coin) but to be upon our Guard, and to try the Spirits, (1 Thes. 5. 19, 20, 21. 1 John 4. 1.) examining the Motions of the Spirit within us, by the sure Rule of Gods written Word; which even Cardinal Bona confesses to be a sufficient Rule to try Spirits by. (*Cum Scriptum sit (inquit) lucerna pedibus meis, verbum tuum, & lumen semitæ meis: sit quæ sacra Scriptura; sicut; Apostolus (2 Tim. 3. 16.) Divinitus inspirata, utilis ad docendam & ad erudiendum in Justitiâ, ut perfectus sit homo dei, ad omne opus bonum instructus; sufficiens apparatus ad spirituum Discretionem, in eâ vocal dubio reperitur.* Bona de discretionem spirituum, Edit. Paris, 1673. Cap. 5. p. 54. Without doubt (saith the Cardinal, there is in the Scripture sufficient means to discern Spirits by.) And withal, we ought to be very modest, humble, holy, and charitable; exercising our selves to have always a Conscience void of offence

toward God and toward Men. And if we do so, God, who is faithful, will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able, 1 Cor. 10. 13. The infinitely Good, Wise, and Faithful God, will not suffer any of his Faithful People to be invincibly tempted by Satanical Delusions. God, by his Word and Providence, always furnishes his People with Means to discern Divine from Satanical Inspirations and Enthusiasms: Otherwise, if we could not discern the one from the other, Divine Inspirations would be of no use, but might be a Trap and a Snare to the Best of God's People; which were Blasphemy to assert, and is contrary to the daily Pattern of the Church of England, which continually prays, *That God would cleanse the Thoughts of their Hearts by the Inspiration of his Holy Spirit*: And let any sober, intelligent Man read the Life of *Hacket* and his two Prophets, as it was written and published by Dr. *Causins*, no Friend, but an Enemy to Dissenters, and he may see, that their Pretended-Inspired Prayers had the Devil's Mark imprinted upon them in Capital Letters. I will mention but one such Mark: It was usual with them, in their Prayers, to call upon God to confound them, to destroy and damn them, if what they said was not true, and they were not Men extraordinarily and immediately called of God to reform the Church, as they pretended to be. By this one Mark it is easie for any Man of Sense to see and judge that certainly they were Melancholly to a Degree of Madness; or, that they were deluded by the Devil; or, that they were both one and t'other. So much is sufficient for an Answer to our *Causins*: his Instances of Men Diabolically inspired, as he says; which should indeed make Christians watchful against the Stratagems of the Enemy of God and Men, but should never so far fright them out of their Wits, as to make them reject the true genuine Influences and Inspirations of God's Holy Spirit who *helps our Infirmities in Prayer*, Rom. 8. 26.

If my Style in handling this Argument appear to any too severe, I must beg their Pardon, if I want a little Patience to hear the more-than-probable Effects of the Operations of the Holy and Blessed Spirit traduced for *Jesuitical Inventions*, and the Effects of the *Unclean Spirit* in such Cases.

*Difficile est Satyram non Scribere*—

I have been large in this Argument, because it is new; and all I expect to find new in the Discourses I am Animadverting upon: In the other Parts, I believe, fewer Words will serve the turn.



The First Case which our *Casuis*t undertakes to speak to, P. 3. and so to the 26th. is,

1. Case. *Whether Praying in a Form of Words do not stint and limit the Spirit of Prayer?*

I must confess, I have always thought it no inconsiderable Argument prevailing with me to judge it unlawful for me, ministering in Prayer, to use the prescribed Forms of others; *because, by doing it, I must necessarily exclude what Influence or Assistance the Holy Spirit may give me in the Performance of that Holy Duty.* It is true, this is done as to all the People that join with him that ministrereth, but that is quite another Species of Prayer. We know it is the Will of God, that as we sometimes should minister to our selves, and to others, in the Duty of Prayer; so at other times we should only pray by *Communion, or joining with another in Prayer.* This is evidently God's Will, as appears by the constant Practice recorded in Holy Writ. Now, if it be the Will of God that we should sometimes pray only *mentally, whilst one only useth Words in Prayer,* and if it be lawful here to shut out the Spirit's Influence upon our Words, when we are to use no Words, but only to join our *Amen* to him that useth them; it will not therefore follow, that we may do it, when we are our selves to use Words, as to which the Holy Spirit may influence us. And this is all the Unlawfulness in this Case we plead, and which some phrase a *stinting or limiting the Spirit.* For the clearer understanding of this Matter, I will first set down what *Influence upon our Words in Prayer we challenge for the Holy Spirit.* It lieth, as I said in the former Chapter, in two things:

1. *In bringing to remembrance the Word of God.* What Acts are contrary to it, and have been our Sins, and so are Matter of Confession; what things the Word of God gives us leave to ask, and under what Circumstances, and what we have need of, what Promises God hath made for giving them to us. Now this is no more than Christ promised, *Joh. 14. 26. The Holy Ghost shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.* We challenge no such thing for the Holy Spirit, as dictating new Matter, not contained in the Word, but bringing to our Minds what Things are in the Word fit for *Confession, Supplication, or Thanksgiving,* as to us, or others. 2. Nor, Secondly, must that Power be denied the Holy Spirit which any of our Brethren have; they can whisper such things in our Ears, and so bring them to our Minds (tho' it may be we were not aware of them, or had forgotten them) we believe the Holy Spirit can make *immediate Impressions*

*pressions*, upon our Spirits, proportionate to the Sounds Creatures can make in our Ears, from which *Impressions* are made upon our Souls: Those who deny this, must deny all Spiritual Motions from the Blessed Spirit of God.

2. We also challenge for the Holy Spirit a Power to excite and inflame the Affections, which, so heated, thrust out Words in a natural Course. This is all we plead for in the Case, and say, That if in Prayer we be limited by a Form of Words, such kind of *Impressions* as these cannot affect us, nor have any Effect upon us suitable to the Nature of them, and the Holy Spirit's Design in making of them; and this we think is not lawful for us to allow, because it is a quenching of the Spirit.

Our Casuist tells us, That he will also examine, *What the Scripture attributeth to the Spirit in Prayer.* 2. *What it is to stint or limit the Spirit.* He saith, *The Scripture attributeth something to the Spirit in Prayer, which was extraordinary and temporary; and something ordinary, fix'd, and standing.* That which he mentions as extraordinary, is, the Inspiration of the Matter of Prayer, together with an Ability to express it in known, or unknown Languages. To which I answer,

There is thus much Truth in this; That it is sufficiently probable, that before the full Revelation of the Will of God in Scripture, God did extraordinarily inspire his Servants, as to some particular Matter of Prayer, how otherwise could they know what was his Will? And that also upon the first going of the Apostles to the Gentiles, it pleased God also to enable the Apostles to pray with divers Tongues; nor was this only for a Sign to them that believed not, but as a necessary Mean, by which the first Messengers of Christ to the Gentiles were enabled both to pray with, and to preach to several Nations. But that after the full Revelation of the Divine Will in the Holy Scriptures, God at any time more than other hath revealed the Matter of Prayer unto his People, more than the Matter of Preaching, is more than I know, or any can prove; nor can any Reason be given for such an Assertion, he had in his written Word told his Ministers and People what they should pray for; nor might they pray for any thing but what was according to that his revealed Will.

2. If by revealing the Matter of Prayer, this Author means no more than bringing to Ministers and Peoples Minds such things as they stand in need of, and God in his Word hath declared himself, ready to give, it is no more than God yet doth every Day.

2. If by it he meaneth his exciting them, at this or that time, to pray for some particular Good, either for a Nation, or Church, or a particular Family, or Person, which he had only generally promised in his Word, and left them at Liberty to pray for, conditionally, and with a reference and Submission to his Divine Will and Wisdom, neither can this be called *extraordinary*, with reference to any Period of Time, it being no more than what God hath by his Spirit done in all Times, and yet doth; tho' in another Sense this be *extraordinary*, such more-than-ordinary Impressions, being but at such particular Times, when God intendeth to give out such Mercies; other extraordinary and temporary Revelations of the Matter of Prayer, after the Sealing of the Canon of Scripture, are such as nothing in Scripture guideth any to expect. And to assert any such thing, is but to dictate without Shadow of Proof either from Scripture or Reason.

Nor is it more true, that there ever were any extraordinary Assistances of the Spirit at any time, as to the Words used in Prayer, further than the inabling the first Ministers and Christians to pray and preach in other Tongues than they had learned. Nor can it be proved, that as to praying in their own Language, the Holy Spirit ever was further promised or given to any, than to bring to their Remembrance the Things they stood in need of, and which God had given them leave to pray for, and promised to give, and the like, and exciting their Affections, and inflaming them, which being heated, they spake with their Tongues; which Assistance, we do say, is an ordinary and standing Influence communicated, as to former Ages, so to our present Age, and will be communicated to Believers to the End of the World. Let us hear what Reason our *Casuis*t hath to the contrary: He pretendeth to give us Four, P. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, &c. to 21.

1. His first Reason is, *Because there is no Promise of any such Gift*, which, were it true, were indeed a strong Reason, tho' not against the thing, (for God may give what he hath no where particularly promised,) yet against our Expectation of any such thing. But this is very far from being Truth: For, 1. There are general Promises of all good things, and of his Spirit. 2. There are particular Promises of the Holy Spirit to help us in the Duty of Prayer. So that, if this Influence be a good thing, and what is possible, without any Derogation to the Honour of God, there are Promises enough for it. He who looketh for a particular Promise for every thing, will deprive himself of the comfortable Expectation of

E

much

much Good, and disable himself from praying in Faith for most things he prayeth for. God hath promised, *Psal. 84. 11. No good thing will be withhold from them that walk uprightly.* He hath promised to give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him; and he hath told us, that by this Spirit we cry, *Abba Father*, Rom. 8. 15. *Gal. 4. 6.* and told us, *Rom. 8.* That the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought. He gives his Spirit to his People, they are joined to the Lord, and one Spirit, and his Spirit dwells in them, as we often read in Scripture. He hath promised, that his Spirit shall bring to remembrance the things we have heard of him, *Joh. 14. 26.* But it may be he will say, There is no Promise of Assistance as to Words in Prayer: What should be the Meaning of that? There is no Promise indeed of the Holy Spirit standing by, and dictating to us what Words to speak, nor yet of the Spirit's so possessing us as the Evil Spirit doth a *Demoniack*, so as to lay our Soules asleep, while he useth our Tongue. But there are Promises of his teaching us to cry, *Abba Father*; of his bringing to our remembrance what the Scripture hath of his making *Intercession* for us, &c. These are enough for us, and to prove all that ordinary Assistance as to Words in Prayer which we plead for.

Nor doth our *Casnist* say any thing of Force, to perswade us, That such Influence and Assistance of the Spirit is not within the Latitude of the Promises, in saying, *That there are many good Christians who would never pretend to any such Inspiration, but are some of them beholden to their own Recollection and Invention for the Matter and Words of their Prayer; and others, for want of a sufficient Quickness of Invention, to be beholden to Forms of Prayer of other Mens Composure.* (P. 6.) Now there are no such Blessings of the New Covenant, to which good Christians may have no Right and Title, and of which they may never actually partake, which is utterly to destroy the Nature of the Covenant, &c.

That there are no Blessings of the New Covenant, to which every true Believer hath no Right or Title, or which they may never actually partake of, is most freely granted. But that there are some Blessings of the New Covenant, which every good Christian doth enjoy, tho' he lieth under other Apprehensions, and which he may have a *Jus Remotum*, a Right and Title to, which, *pro hic & nunc*, he doth not actually enjoy; and some Blessings of the Covenant which a Christian might enjoy, if indeed he did not by his voluntary Fault deprive himself of the Benefit of them;

and

and some Blessings which a young Christian doth not at present enjoy, must be denied by no Considerate Divine: For who ever saith it, must deny both the *Quickening* and *Consolatory* Influences of the Holy Spirit, and many more also indeed; for the Promises relating to *Justification* and *Regeneration*, as every Believer hath a Right to them, so he actually partakes of them, as he shall do of Eternal Life. But for those Branches of the Covenant which concern *Further Grace*, or *Gifts*, the Case is otherwise. Every good Christian hath a Right and Title to the *Spirit of Adoption*, teaching him to cry *Abba Father*, influencing him in the manner I have opened, as to Words in Prayer. But yet it is very possible,

1. That by his own voluntary Fault he may shut out these Influences by tying himself up to Forms of Words.

2. He may want them, through his own Default, in not studying the Scriptures, and gaining a full Knowledge of them.

3. He may deprive himself of them by wilful Sinnings, which may make the Holy Spirit withdraw himself in those arbitrary Manifestations.

4. He may have them, and not know it, but take them to be meer Humane and Natural Recollections, to which the Holy Spirit hath assisted, by bringing to remembrance what Christ hath said.

Our *Casuis*t's Second Reason, p. 7. is, *Because there is no need of any such immediate Inspiration.* This indeed (were it true) were a great Argument, and would Prove what he said before, That there are no Promises of any such Tendency. But how will he prove this? He saith, 1. *As to the Matter of Prayer, it is sufficiently revealed in Scripture.* 2. He saith, *For Words, if we have not Quickness enough of Fancy and Invention to express our Wants and Desires in our own Words, we may readily supply that Defect by Forms of other Mens Composure, which, with very short Additions and Variations of our own, we may easily adapt to all our particular Cases and Circumstances.* This is the Summ of what he saith, P. 2. p. 8, 9.

If the Matter of Prayer be sufficiently revealed in Holy Writ, there neither is, nor ever was, since the Apostles Time, any need of any extraordinary Assistance of the Spirit to dictate that. But (admitting this, which we freely grant) is there yet no need of the Spirit to bring to remembrance the things we have had of Christ's? Our particular Violations of the Divine Law, our particular Wants, or the Promises warranting us to beg a Supply: To assert no need of the Spirit's Help, we must not only assert the



Perfection of the *Rule of Prayer*, but the Perfection of an *Human Memory* too, which, I suppose, our *Casnist* will not.

2. As to Words, our *Casnist* talks as if he thought we pleaded for the Spirit's dictating formed Words to us, or made use of our Tongues to speak Words not formed in our own Hearts: What else doth he mean by *Words immediately inspired*? Alas! we mean no such thing, but only a bringing into our Thoughts the Matter of Scripture, relating to Things forbidden, commanded, promised, &c. From which, our Souls, by a natural Power, form Words, and warming and heating our Affections, which also contribute to them, and then thrust them out at our Lips, as the *Psalmist* speaks, *Psal.* 39. 3. Now how it can be, that *Forms* should not shut out this Assistance and Influence, poseth me to understand.

3. Our *Casnist's* Third Reason is, p. 9. *Because there is no certain Sign nor Testimony of it amongst us.* By Signs, as he expounds himself, p. 10. he means *Miracles*. He gives his Pretended Reason for this, *Because, without such Signs to distinguish it from false Pretences, we were better be without Inspiration than with it, because we shall be lest under an unavoidable Necessity, either of admitting all Inspirations which pretend to be Divine, or of rejecting all that are truly so.*

According to this rate of Arguing, we must conclude nothing to be the Effect of the Spirit of God, but what we can confirm to be so by *working* some *Miracle*. Alas! how should Christians (if this had a Grain of Truth in it) ever be able to satisfy themselves that they truly believe in Christ, or love, or fear God, or exercised, or had any Habit of Grace? God indeed gave the Gift of Miracles to confirm *new Doctrines*, or some *Prophecies*, or *Persons* extraordinary Missions. But did ever any Divine make Miracles necessary to confirm every *Manifestation of the Spirit*? And why are they necessary for this more than any other?

Is it not Sign enough to him who believeth the Scriptures to be the Word and Revealed Will of God, that the Inspiration is from God, if it be according to the Revealed Will of God? Surely one, who being about to pray, hath any thing brought into his Mind to confess, beg, or give Thanks for, which he knows is according to the Revealed Will of God his Duty to confess, beg, or give Thanks for, may know, or at least reasonably think, it is brought to his Thoughts by the Holy Spirit of God, tho' he cannot confirm it to be so by a miraculous Operation.

*But (saith our Casnist) tho' the Scripture may be sufficient to discover the Matter of the Inspiration, whether it be true or false, yet it is*

not sufficient to distinguish the Inspiration, whether it be Divine, or Natural, or Diabolical. Then he runs into a Discourse of Natural and Diabolical Enthusiasms; and concludes, That Men may be inspired naturally, or from the Devil, and how dangerous it is to favour such Inspirations upon the Spirit of God.

1. For *natural Inspiration*, it is a kind of unintelligible Thing; for surely he that is inspired, doth *aliquid pati*, suffer something, and to suffer it to receive the *Assion* of a foreign Agent: So that, to speak modestly, (tho' *Natural Inspiration* be a Canting Term, devised by some of late for no very good Purpose,) it is no very good *Natural Sense*, carrying with it *contradictionem in adjecto*, which is not very Scholastick. It is true, a Man may have a natural or accidental Fervency of Spirit, occasioned several natural and honest ways, as well as by some less honest; and I do not think it much dishonourable to the Holy Spirit to make use of those natural Means to excite the Affections.

Our *Casist* is aware that this Third Reason of his will have the same, if not a greater Force against that Assistance of the Spirit in Prayer, which he, and others of his Mind, are willing to allow, (that he might not be called the *Spirit of Supplication* for nothing,) viz. in exciting and inflaming the Affections, whose Fervour cannot be denied also, to proceed sometimes from the Temper of the Body, and they will be at a Loss there also to distinguish betwixt the Fervour that is Divine and that which is Natural in its Causation. But how will he avoid it? He tells us, p. 12. *That as to this, we have a sure Word of Promise; but not for the latter; and therefore, if we can claim a Promise, we have just Reason to conclude, that how much soever other Causes might contribute towards it, the Holy Spirit was the Principal Cause.*

I hope my Reader, from what I have said before, will see Reason to conclude, that we may as well claim Promises, and more than one, for that Influence which we claim for the Holy Spirit upon our Words in Prayer; as for the Influence it hath upon our Affections; and if he will but name us the *Texts* and *Promises* he hath for the Spirit's Influence upon our Affections, it is ten to one but we shall prove, that those very Texts, if *Rom. 8. 15, 26. Gal. 4. 6.* as much concern Words, and contain Promises for Assistance as to Words, as the exciting of Affections; and we are pretty sure of it, considering the great Influence raised Affections have upon our Words expressive of them, so as we are Even; and if there.

there need no Miracle to prove the one to be Divine, neither doth there need any to prove the other Influence Divine also.

2. As to *Diabolical Inspiration*, we have spoken before. The Probability of such a thing is a very bold Suggestion: We cannot deny but the Devil may sometimes suggest Scriptures to us. He did so to our Saviour, *Matth. 4. 6.* But it is a sure Rule, that he *never doth it but for obvious and apparently sinful Ends.* If a Minister, or a conscientious Christian, be conscious to himself, that he hath no other Ends in Prayer than to glorifie God, in obeying his Will, to humble his Soul before God for his Sins, and to beg and obtain his Pardon, and such Influences of Grace as his Soul stands in need of, and he finds Scriptures pertinent to these Things brought to his Mind, he hath no Reason but to conclude they come from the Holy Spirit; nor needeth he any Miracle to confirm it. The End will both demonstrate the A<sup>c</sup>t, and also discover the Principle plainly enough.

But, p. 14. our *Casnist* riseth higher, telling us, *That we have not only no certain Sign of any such Inspiration in the conceived Prayers of those which must pretend to it, but many certain ones of the contrary.* Four he will instance in, upon which he descaints, p. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

1. The great Impertinence, and Nonsense, and Rudeness, to say no worse, that are sometimes mingled with these extempore Prayers.

2. That they are so generally tinged with the particular Opinions of those that offer them.

3. That that which gives them the Reputation of being so inspired, is not so much the Matter, as the way and manner of expressing them.

4. That that extraordinary manner and way of expressing them, for which they are thought to be inspired, doth apparently proceed from natural Causes. The two latter be calleth Plain Signs: Let us try the Certainty and Truth of any of them.

I observe his first Sign is wonderfully qualified with Sometimes, which takes out all the Efficacy of it; for I suppose our *Casnist* hath heard of such an Axiome as this; *Spiritus Dei non semper tangit Prophetatum*, &c. The best Prophet is not always a true Prophet; even *Nathan* himself falsely revealed the Will of God to *David*, 2 Sam. 7. 3. *Go do all that is in thine heart; for the Lord is with thee.* God sent him the next Morning to tell *David* the quite contrary. And *Paul*, who sometimes spake what he had received from the Lord, 1 Cor. 11. 23. and 1 Cor. 7. 10. saith, *Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord; v. 12.* of that same Chapter,



ter, faith, *But to the rest spake I, not the Lord.* So that (with our *Casnist's* Leave) supposing it true, that at some time some Phrases may slip, which some Criticks may call *Nonsense*, (and oft-times they will call that so which is not so,) or which should, in their Judgment, be rude and indecent, or perhaps worse: Supposing, that some at some times should in their Prayers declare their own Opinions, which are not Truth: Neither of these would any more prove, that these Mens Words, in other Parts of their Prayers, or at other Times in Prayer, were not influenced by the Holy Spirit; then *David's* Murther and Adultery, *Lot's* Incest, *Peter's* Denial of his Master, would prove that they were not in the general Course of their Conversation led by the Spirit of God; or, that *Nathan* was never influenced in his Prophecy by the Holy Spirit, because he was not when he approved of *David's* Resolution to build God an House. So plain are the two first Signs, that indeed they are no Signs, nor have any colour of such a thing, further than concerns those Phrases so culpable.

2. Nor, it may be, upon a strict Enquiry, will it be found, that in Publick there is more *Nonsense* in free Prayers than some make by their careless reading Forms. I do not think our *Casnist*, who hath sometimes used, and doth still sometimes in the Pulpit use free Prayer, so Chargeable; and I have Reason to think there are some Hundreds of Ministers in *England*, of whom it may be full as Charitably presumed.

2. For this Second Sign, I know no Error can be in a Man's declaring his own Opinions in Prayer, if they be true. I know no Man who prayeth by Forms, or otherwise, but must declare some of his own Opinions. If he means by Opinions, his *weird* *Airs*, singular Opinions, which are false, it will only prove, that he did *aliquid humanum pati*, and was not influenced, as to those Words, by the Spirit of Truth.

3. For his Third, which he calls a Plain Sign: That that which gives them the Reputation of being so (that is from the Spirit) is not so much the Matter, as the way and manner of expressing them. What gives them the Reputation amongst weak People, of coming from the Spirit, is one thing; what indeed makes them so, is another thing. That which makes them so with others indiscernable, being the secret Work of the Spirit upon the Heart, bringing Scripture to remembrance, and exciting and inflaming the Affections, which cause the Thoughts to form Words, which are by the Affections thrust out of the Lips; all this is now a thing indiscernable.

able to an Hearer, who can only probably and charitably judge from the expressed Affections by Sighs and Groans, and proper Expressions.

I know none makes the Spirit's Influence upon our Words to respect the Matter of Prayer, further than bringing to the Mind of him that prayeth, Matter before prepared in Scripture, fitted for his Circumstances at this or that time. All his other Discourse under this Head, hath nothing in it of Argument, but is only Defamatory of any other Prayer than by Forms, (so far as he is able to defame it,) and proceeds wholly upon a Mistake of the Principle; for the Spirit's Influence doth not only respect the way and manner of expressing, but, as I have said, the very Matter of Prayer itself, for this or that time, bringing to a Christian's Remembrance the true Matter of Prayer, and what at that time is proper for a Christian. Nor can I imagine with what Consistency to himself our *Casuiſt* makes this a plain Sign of conceived Prayers not being inspired: That that which gives them Reputation to be so, is not so much the Matter, as the manner and way of expressing them; when himself alloweth all along the Spirit's Influence to excite pious and devout Affections, which certainly do not respect the Matter, but the manner and the way, and manner of expressing our Prayers. Our *Casuiſt* triflcth too much in making the only Difference between Forms and Conceived Prayers, to be, 1. That the one is in Set Words, the other in Extemporany Words: 2. In the Largeness of them, and repeating the same things over and over again. Before he had wasted his Paper in confuting such Fooleries, he should have heard us asserting them here. — *Qui capit, ille facit.*

4. His Fourth plain Sign, is, That that extraordinary manner and way of expressing them, for which they are thought to be inspired, doth apparently proceed from Natural Causes: Which neither he, nor an Angel of Heaven, can know, nor any but he who knows the Heart, and what Hand strikes those Strings of the Affections, from the touching of which, those Sounds proceed. 2. How unreasonable is this for him to say, who will allow the Holy Spirit no Influence, but upon our Affections, exciting and inflaming them? 3. Suppose they do proceed from natural Causes, why may not the Holy Spirit set those natural Causes on work? All which being most certain, there needs nothing be said to the further vain Philosophy he useth upon this Head. Whether it be true, or false, is not of a Pin value, as to the Cause in hand. It may be from natural Causes, and yet too from a first Cause setting them on work.

Work. None will say, but the Holy Spirit makes use of natural Causes for spiritual Effects.

In his 21. p. he comes to a Fourth Argument, to prove, *That the Gift of Inspiration of Prayer* (as he odly phraseth it) *doth not continue, is, Because then conceived Prayers must be Infallible, and of equal Authority with the Word of God.* We are very unhappy that in these Debates, we either will not or cannot understand one another.

Do we plead for any more than the Spirits helping our weak Memories, in bringing to remembrance what Things are contrary to the Divine Law, for the Matter of Confession; and of what God hath declared in his Word, he will give to them that ask him, upon such Terms as he hath declared his Will, for Matter of Petition, and the Divine Promises, for Arguments to inforce our Petitions, &c. So that, if the Word of God be infallible, that which is so brought to remembrance, must certainly be so too; and surely the Scripture must be of the same Authority with it self. If we mistake in the Applications, we father not our Mistakes on the Holy Spirit, but beg Pardon for them. This being rightly understood, I refer to any Intelligent Reader, what Strength there is in this Argument more than in those we heard before.

Our Casuist, having thus far given us his Opinion against the Continuance of that Influence of the Spirit upon us in Prayer, which he called extraordinary, comes p. 22. to favour us with his Opinion; *Wherein the ordinary influences of the Spirit consist, relating to the Duty of Prayer.* He tells us it is, *In exciting in us the Graces, and proper Affections of Prayer.* Such as *Shame, and Sorrow in the Confession of Sins, a Sense of our need of Mercy, and an hope* (surely he should have added also an intense Desire) *of obtaining it, in our Supplications for Pardon, &c.*

In all this, we most freely agree with him, saving only in the *Restriction* of the Spirits influence to this only. Nor can we possibly understand, how the Spirit should thus influence our *Affections*, and not our Words; which are and ought to be thrust out by those Affections. We will suppose a Soul to be guilty of *wandering Thoughts in the Duty of Prayer* (a guilt common to all Persons) and the Spirit, who in the Word hath accused and condemned this, to bring this to a Souls remembrance when it is praying, or about to Pray; and to excite in the Soul, a shame and sorrow for it, and inward Desire and Hope of Pardon for them. Can this Soul be thus far in this Particular be influenced, and not

influenced, as to Words also expressive of this Desire and Hope? Our *Casuiſt* further tells us, p. 32.

*That Words and Expressions are of no other Account with God, than as they ſignifie the Graces, and Affections of our Hearts, without which he regards them no more then the whiſtling of the Wind. All this is very true, but what then?*

*Therefore (ſaith our Caſuiſt) ſince theſe Affections are the main of our Prayer, and Words are nothing in his account in Compariſon with them; can any Man be ſo vain, as to imagine that thoſe Affections will be ever a whit the leſs acceptable to him, becauſe they are preſented in a Form of Words, and not in extemporary Effuſions. To which I Answer, truly no.*

But admit, that the Holy Spirit to Day or to Morrow, bring to our Mind from Scripture, ſome Particular-Sins as Matter of Confession, which are not mentioned (unleſs generally) in the Form we are to uſe, and excites in us a ſhame, and ſorrow for them; and an earneſt Deſire, or Hope, for the Pardon of them, and the Chriſtian hath no Words in his Form expreſſive of ſuch Shame, Sorrow, Deſire, or Hope, how acceptable do we think will this Prayer be unto God, which is but half a Prayer? For though the Motions of the Affections be a part of Prayer, yet it is not all Prayer, and ſcarcely any where in Holy Writ call'd by that Name; at leaſt not in one Place of Forty, where Prayer is mentioned. As for the Senſes which our *Casuiſt* puts upon thoſe Texts, *Gal. 4. 6. Rom. 8. 15, 26. Jude v. 20.* He ſhould have done well to have proved what he Dictates, that *they concern not our Words in Prayer*, we are quite otherwiſe minded, and think that the Spirit may influence us with *Sighs and Groans*, that cannot be fully uttered (as no great Paſſions can) yet may be in a great meaſure uttered, and ſo uttered, as to let thoſe that hear them, know they are imperfectly uttered, which is often diſcern'd, though not by Non-ſence; yet by abruptures of Phraſe and Expreſſion, and the incoherence of them alſo ſometimes.

In the next Place our *Casuiſt* comes to explain *ſtinting*, and *limiting the Spirit*. Where firſt he quarrels at the *Phraſe* as being not found in Scripture nor *Antiquity*, he ſaith. It is a *Term of Art invented by us*, applied only to the *preſent Controverſie*, and this plainly argueth the *Argument to be New*.

I dare ſay, the Author cannot find the *Term of Natural Enthuſiaſms*, or *Inſpiration* in Scripture; nor yet the new invented Notion of *Diabolical Inſpiration of Men to the Duty of Prayer*, in any *Antiquity*:

tiquity: Yet our *Casuiſt* maketh no ſcruple to uſe them both, why may not we have the ſame Liberty? Nor do we apply it meerly to the preſent Caſe, we are every whit as much againſt *Forms* of Sermons. And what matters it, if the *Argument* be new, provided it be an Argument, and be ſtrong? But, neither is it new; it is a great while ago, ſince the Apoſtle commanded the *Theſſalonians*, ſaying, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 19. *Quench not the Spirit.* Now if the Spirit kindleth, and inflameth the Affections, and they influence the Thoughts to form ſuitable Words, and then the Tongue cannot utter them, becauſe it is tied up to ſome certain Words and Syllables, I think it is quenched, ſo far as it is capable, that is, its Operations are quenched, and made to die in the Heart.

Nor doth our *Casuiſt* perfectly expreſs our meaning in this Phraſe of *Limiting the Spirit*, for we by it do not ſo much mean *binding the Spirit from affording us ſome Aſſiſtance which we might otherwiſe expect from it.* As, That we binder our ſelves from making a due and perfect uſe of that Aſſiſtance, which the Holy Spirit is ready to give us, both by bringing Things to remembrance which we have forgot; and alſo exciting, and inflaming our Affections. For though they may yet burn within us, yet in the uſe of Forms, they cannot (as they ought to make up a perfect Prayer) burſt out at our Lips, we muſt not ſpeak with our Tongues, as David, *Pſalm* 39. 3. And this indeed may provoke God to withdraw theſe Aſſiſtances from us.

And now in Oppoſition to our *Casuiſts* Conclusion I alſo conclude. I have ſhewed at large, that there is an ordinary Aſſiſtance which the Holy Spirit giveth to, conſcientious Chriſtians about to Pray, or in Prayer. 1. By bringing to remembrance the Matter of Prayer (recorded in Holy Writ) proper for this, or that Time of Prayer, both for matter of *Confefſion*, *Supplication*, and *Thankſgiving*, which (through the frailty of our Memories) we often do not at that Time think of. 2. By exciting and inflaming Holy and Pious Affections, ſuited to every Part of that Duty. Now by keeping our ſelves to forms, we ſhut out theſe Influences of the Holy Spirit, either rejecting them, or not being able (becauſe reſtrained by Forms) to make uſe of them as to a perfect Prayer. What our *Casuiſt* hath ſaid, or any one can ſay to diſprove this, I refer to any Reader indued but with common Senſe to Judge. So much in Answer to what our *Casuiſt* hath ſaid as to the firſt Caſe ſtated by him. The Second followeth.



Case 2. *Whether the use of Publick Forms, be not a sinful neglect of the Ministerial Gift of Prayer?*

Our *Casuist* hath here very rightly stated our Case thus, p. 26. 'By the Gift of Prayer, they mean an Ability to express our Minds to God in Prayer, or to offer up our Desires and Affections to him; in Words, befitting the Matter of them. Which Ability, say they, is given by God to his Ministers, as a mean for Publick Prayer; and in order to their being the Mouths of the Congregation to God, to represent to him, the common Cases, and Necessities of the People. And therefore, since God (say they) hath given us this Gift, it may be justly questioned, whether we may lawfully omit the use of it, by using Publick Forms of other Mens Composure.

In speaking to this *Case*, our Author premiseth two Things, and then laieth down four Conclusions, all which I shall candidly examine in their Order.

1. *That this Case concerneth the Clergy only, not the Laity.* That is true, so far as concerneth *Publick Prayer* in Churches. This Argument will not indeed conclude it sinful for Christians to join in Prayer, with such Ministers as use pious and good Forms. What others may do, I cannot tell.

2. He premiseth, *That this is not the Case of the Clergy of the Church of England, who though they stand obliged to the constant use of the Liturgy, yet are not hereby restrained from the Exercise of their own Abilities in Publick Prayer in their Pulpits.* I shall say nothing to the Case of these, or these *Clergy-men*. There hath been enough said as to this, by the Author of the *Reasonable Account*, p. 12, and 13. I therefore come to his Conclusions.

1. He saith, *That this Ability to express in our own Words the common Devotions of our Congregations to God, is either Natural, or Acquired.* We will grant this without more Words about it. It is partly *Natural*, speaking is so, partly *Acquired*, to speak fitly, and properly to God in Prayer is *Acquired*.

2. He saith, *That this Natural, or Acquired Gift is no where appropriated by God to Prayer, but left common to other uses and purposes.* Whether in Words of Scripture it be any where by God so appropriated, is not worth the disputing; if from the Nature of the Ability, Gift, or thing it self it be so appropriated; which that it is, I think is clear enough from the Description of it given by our *Casuist*, p. 26. where he hath these Words, *By the Gift of Prayer, they mean an Ability to express our Minds to God in Prayer, or to offer*

fer up our Desires, and Affections to him, in Words besitting the Matter of them.

Nor hath our *Casnist* before contradicted this Notion, now how it is possible that an *Ability* fitly to express our Minds to God in Prayer, can relate to any thing but Prayer, I cannot understand; if he had indeed in stating the Question, or explicating it, have denied this Notion, there might have been some colour for this Assertion, but now to tell us (as he doth p. 30.) That the Gift of Prayer is nothing but a freedom of Elocution, or Utterance is very impertinent. But this is fully answered in the *Reasonable Account*, p. 10. and again in the Answer to Dr. Falkners *Vindication of Liturgies*, p. 36, 37. but to add, yet a little further.

The Question is, Whether an *Ability*, fitly to express our Minds to God in Prayer, be a Gift differing from the Lawyers *Ability* to plead well at the Bar; or a Mans *Ability* to Discourse pertinently in good Company, or a Schollars *Ability* to Dispute well in the Schools. Our *Casnist* saith plainly, they are but one and the same Gift.

1. By our *Casnists* Ratiocination, those also must be the same Gift with the Gift of Preaching (which admitted) it must necessarily follow, that he who is able to plead a Case well at a Bar, or to Discourse well in Company, must be able also to Preach a good Sermon, and to express himself fitly to God in Prayer. Which (besides, that it would justify the *Socinian*, in telling the World, That they have been a long Time troubled with a needless sort of Men called Preachers or Ministers) is most demonstrably false, there being some Thousands in the World, that can Discourse well in Company, and many Lawyers that can Plead very well at a Bar; and several Schollars that can Dispute in Mood and Figure, that if they were put to it to Pray and Preach in a Pulpit, few would think they had a Gift, that is an *Ability* for either.

2. According to this Notion all Gods Gifts, as to external Action might be reduced to the Gift of Motion. All spiritual Habits to the one Gift of the Spirit; but the Apostle speaks after another Rate. 1 Cor. 12. 4. Now there are diversity of Gifts, but the same Spirit. And tells ver. 8. To one is given by the Spirit, the Word of Wisdom, to another the Word of Knowledge by the same Spirit. Ver. 10. To another Prophecy — to another the Interpretation of Tongues. All these now flow from the same Spirit, and are all Species indeed of the Gift of Utterance; but if the Apostle understood himself, they were divers Gifts, and by his Authority we must crave leave to call them so.

3. Besides, What can make, or argue a *Diversity of Gifts*, if a *Diversity of Knowledge*, as the Foundation of their Exercise, and a *Diversity of End*, will not? And with what Sense can two Gifts be made the same, when it is demonstrable that every one who hath the one of them, hath not the other, nor any thing like it? Neither is that true which our *Casnist* tells us, and I admire to read him asserting what is contrary to all Mens Experience; for he saith, 'We find, that those who have this Gift, (*viz. of Prayer*) have it not only while they are speaking in Prayer, but when they are speaking on their Occasions; and that ordinarily they can express themselves to Men with the same Readiness and Fluency in Conversation, as they can express their Minds to God in Prayer. Either he means *all such*, or only *some such*. If he speaks of all, it is most evidently false: How many have we known that want no Words or proper Expressions in Prayer, that in Worldly Affairs cannot speak to any purpose. If he meaneth it of some only, he speaketh true, but nothing to the purpose; for the same Man might, in the Apostles Times, have the *Word of Wisdom*, and the *Word of Knowledge*, and *Prophecy*, and *Interpretation of Tongues*. The Apostles, doubtless, had them all, yet the Apostle determines them, *Diversity of Gifts*, 1 Cor. 12. 4, 8, 9, 10.

3. In the Third Place he tells us, *That this Gift of Utterance not being appropriated by God to Prayer, may, upon just Reasons, be as lawfully omitted in Prayer, as in any other Use or Purpose it is designed for.*

Here our *Casnist* supposeth, that the Gift of Prayer is nothing but the Gift of Utterance, which we have disproved under the former Head. 2. That the Gift of Prayer is not appropriated to Prayer, which we have also disproved; so as this Conclusion falls by the Fall of the two Pillars on which it is built only. I must not omit what our *Casnist* hath here said excellently, p. 31. 'I do confess, had God any where appropriated it to the End of Prayer, those who have it were obliged to use it to that End, and to omit it ordinarily, by confining themselves to Forms of other Mens inditing, would be to neglect a Means of Prayer of God's special Appointment and Institution; for had he any where intimated to us, that he gave it us purely to enable us to pray, without respect to any other End, we could not have omitted the Use of it, without crossing his Intention, and frustrated him of the only End for which he intended it. Here our *Casnist* hath spoke our Heart; only we think, that if this appears from the Nature of the Gift, which is  
such

such as it is impossible to use it any other way, it is the same thing as if he had told it us in so many Words in Scripture, or by an Angel from Heaven. Let it now be left to any Man of Sense to judge whether we have not proved this, and that from our *Casnist's* own Words, p. 26. where he accepts the *Question* as stated by us, as well as from the *Nature of the Gift it self*, being not *Utterance*, tho' a *Species* of it; a Gift exercised from a different *Species* of *Knowledge* than other Gifts are that fall under *Utterance* as the *Genus*, and to a quite different *End*, and not found in Thousands who have *Utterance* good enough in other things.

4. Our *Casnist's* last Conclusion upon this Case, is, 'That to rend our Desires to God in other Mens Words, is as much a Means of Prayer as to speak them in our own; for to speak in our own Words, is no otherwise a Means of Publick Prayer, than as it serves to express to God the common Cases and Necessities of the Congregation; and if these may be as well expressed in other Mens Words as in our own, the End of Publick Prayer is as effectually served by the one as the other, p. 32.

1. In the first place, It is not yet agreed, that *Reading in Prayer* is that sacred Action which the Scripture any where calls *Prayer*. This hath been argued in the *Reasonable Account*, Chap. 7. and what is there said, hath been vindicated, Chap. 7. of the Answer to Dr. *Falkner's Vindication*: So as that Point lieth not yet cleared.

2. When we speak of *Means*; referring to *Divine* and *Sacred Actions*, we vainly philosophize in our measuring true Means from the Proportion we judge they have to the End. If God, either in *Nature*, or in his *Revealed Will*, hath directed any Means, it is most certain that Means is to be used now; that he hath so, hath been proved in the *Reasonable Account*, p. 6, 7. and what hath been there said, hath also been vindicated from Dr. *Falkner's* Exceptions to it, in the Answer to his *Vindication of Liturgies*, p. 39. 62, 63, 64. When what is there said, hath received a just Answer, there will need more Words in this Argument. It hath also been told our Adversaries in this Point, That the speaking of Words first formed in our own Hearts, is not only a *Divine Mean*, but *Natural* and *Proper*, (there can be nothing more natural than for the Tongue to speak, out of the abundance of the heart; nothing more proper to express our Words,  $\alpha\iota\delta\omega$ , formed in our Heads, than by our own Words,  $\alpha\iota\epsilon\omega$ , and certainly any Means, *Divine*, *Natural*, and *Proper*, ought to have the Preference of others: It is a kind

kind of Force upon the Soul, to make the Tongue speak what is not formed in the Heart.

3. It is true, if Forms were to be made new for every Publick Prayer, it were not impossible but that the End of Prayer might be as well obtained by the use of other Mens Words, as his that ministrerth; otherwise it is not possible. The invariable Wants of a Congregation are very few; *Pardon of Sin, and further Sanctification, and upholding Habits of Grace bestowed, are so.* But how many more? Have not all Congregations renewed Sins, Wants, and Mercies?

4. But to make this Business short. Till what hath been said to prove, That the Gifts of him that ministrerth in the Duty of Prayer are the Means which God hath directed and given the Minister for that use, and the most *natural* and proper Means imaginable for the Performance of the Act, be answered, we vainly discourse of *other Means*, unless any Person hath not obtained this. This is enough to have said, as to what our *Casnist* hath spoken upon his Second Case.

The Third Case which our Author speaks to, is,

Case 3. *Whether the Use of Publick Forms of Prayer doth not deaden the Devotion of Prayer?*

That which our *Author* here calleth the *Devotion of Prayer*, the *Nonconformists* call. *The Attention of our own, or others Thoughts; or the Intension and Fervency of our own, or others Spirits.*

Our Reverend *Casnist* granteth, p. 34.

‘ If Forms are in themselves, and not through our Fault, and erroneous Prejudice, less apt to quicken and raise Devotion than conceived Prayers, it will be granted on all hands that this is a good Argument against them.

‘ Here then is an Issue joined: The *Medium* is granted to be good, if true. Our *Author* propounds, in order to the Trial of the Issue, to consider,

1. ‘ What those Advantages are which conceived Prayers pretend to.

2. ‘ Whether they are not, for the most part, fantastical and imaginary; and whether, so far forth as they are Real, they are not much more peculiar to Forms.

3. Whether, besides those Common Advantages, Publick Forms have not peculiar Advantages which conceived Prayers cannot pretend unto.



If our Author rightly enumerateth the *Advantages* pretended by the *Nonconformists*, and makes it good, that they are but imaginary and fantastical for the most part; and that what of them is real, is more peculiar to *Forms*, (which is his Second Task) and that besides those common *Advantages*, *Forms* have real *Advantages* peculiar to them; we must yield he hath won this Game. But let us examine what he saith.

Only it must first be observed, that the *Nonconformists* have acknowledged the Truth of this Proposition variable: And that may be the best Means to one, both of Attention of Mind, and Intention of Affections, which to another is not so. Reasonable Account, p. 44. §. 27. It very much depends upon Mens having, or not having an Ability to express theirs and others Wants to God in Prayer, and the Degree in which they have it.

Our *Casuiſt* thus enumerateth the pretended *Advantages* that are in free, conceived Prayers:

1. 'Our Minds are kept more attentive to our Business.
2. 'That the Minister is more affected.
3. 'That the Affections of the People are raised by the Performance of the Minister.
4. 'That in conceived Prayers the Words follow the Affections; whereas, when a Man prayeth by Forms, his Affections (if any) must follow his Words.
5. 'That Words formed in our own Hearts are more expressive of our Affections, than it is possible Words formed by others should be.
6. 'That the Soul can better direct its Affections to God, whilst it hath nothing else to do, than when it hath a previous Work to direct the Eye to read right.

This is the Substance of what our Author saith *Nonconformists* say in Proof of their Proposition; and indeed it is a good Summary of what hath been said on this Argument, Whether they be merely imaginary, or real *Advantages* of conceived Prayer, that is the Question.

Our *Casuiſt* ingenuously granteth, p. 36.

That by expressing a serious and devout Affection, the Minister doth really advantage the Devotion of the Congregation: Which is the Third of those Things before-mentioned.

'The first (pretended) Advantage, he saith, p. 37. is, That the very conceiving the Matter of his Prayer, doth naturally more bind his Attention, than the reading it out of a Form.

This is undeniable, and granted by our Author. But he goes on : ' But, I beseech you, what doth it more bind his Attention to ? Is it to attend to the Words and Phrases ? If so, then it is not to attend to the Acts of *Prayer* : Or is it to attend to those Acts which are the proper Business of *Prayer* ; such as being ashamed of Sin, and bewailing of it in Confession, &c.

I answer, It bindeth the Thoughts of a Man praying, to his Business, and to one principal Act of *Prayer*, that is, the uttering of the Desires of his Heart in fit Words. This Answer of our Author depends upon this mistaken Hypothesis, That the uttering of fit precatory Words without Lips, is no part of *Prayer* ; whereas it is an essential part of perfect vocal *Prayer* : And we scarcely read of any thing else called by the Name of *Prayer* in Holy Writ. Which Words being first formed in our own Hearts, must necessarily more affect us than Words formed by others, and are always attended in pious Souls with more of all those Affections, the Exercise of which God requires, than it is almost possible foreign Words should. A Man cannot pronounce another Man's Oration with so much natural Life, Vigour, and Fervency, as one himself hath composed, and which is so fitted to his own Thoughts : Now what should he that ministreth in *Prayer*, attend to, but his Business, and the Work he is about ? Which is as much to utter Words expressive of his inward Shame, and Sorrow, and Hope, and Desire, as to be ashamed, and sorrowful, and to desire, and hope.

Our Author, p. 38. confesseth what none can possibly deny, ' That he who prayeth by a Form, being released from attending to the Invention of his Matter and Words, his Mind is more at leisure to wander, and instead of attending (as he ought) more closely to the Acts of Devotion, by employing those Thoughts which in conceived *Prayer* he employeth in Invention, in a closer Attention to the Acts of Devotion, he may, if he please, permit them to rove abroad ; but if he doth, the Fault is in himself, not in the Form he prayeth by. He makes an ill use of a good thing. To all which I reply,

That whether our Thoughts divert in *Prayer* to other Objects by Consent, or from their own natural Wildness, not being sent upon any Errand from the Will, it must be confessed our Duty to use all lawful Means to keep them at home ; and to use no Means that shall give them further Scope and Liberty of Diversion. Our Reverend Author grants, That the Mind is more at Liberty to wander, when it prayeth by a Form, which is Argument enough to oblige

oblige us, if we have an Ability, to pray by conceived Prayer. Our Author herein differeth from us; for he saith *the Fault is in our selves*, if our Thoughts do wander, *not in the Form*. Those Words [*the Fault is in himself*] may be taken in a double Sense; either, 1. *The Fault is in the Will of Man, which willeth them to wander.* 2. Or, *the Fault is in the Infirmary of Humane Nature*; which is such, as they will wander, if they have a Scope and Liberty. Our Author thinks the former; for he saith, *be may, if he please, permit them to rove*: But may he also, if he please, keep them from wandering and roving? I do not believe there is that Man or Woman upon the Earth, that can in truth say so, upon his own Experience; nay, I much question whether any can say so, who adds to willing, the use of this Means, praying by a free and conceived Prayer, (tho' it must be granted, that he shall do it much better that way than any other.) The Fault therefore is in our *selves*, that is, in the common Infirmary of Humane Nature, its Averseness and Awkwardness to Spiritual Imployment, and the Contemplation of Spiritual Objects, and Exercise of it self upon them; and tho' it be such a Fault as will hardly be perfectly corrected, whilst we are in the Flesh, yet it is such as we may use Means to correct, and in a good measure actually correct, and praying by a conceived Prayer, by our Author's own Confession, is one Means by which it may be corrected; (for he acknowledgeth, that when we use Forms, our Mind hath a greater Scope and Liberty to wander:) So that if free and conceived Prayer be what God hath not forbidden, it is what he hath commanded, (where he hath given an Ability to it) as a Means in order to this great End, in the obtaining of which lieth much of the Life and Soul of Prayer; (for the *Affections* of a roving, wandering Heart will be cold enough,) Thoughts of an Object being necessary to the Workings of the Affections about it, and previously necessary. But saith our Author, p. 39.

' To invent the *Words and Matter of Prayer*, is not to pray, but  
' to study a Prayer; and till our Brethren have proved, that our in-  
' venting the Matter and Words is a part of our Duty of *Prayer*,  
' (which is the Question in debate betwixt us) we can by no Means  
' grant that our Attention to it is attending to the Duty of *Prayer*.

The *Matter of all Prayer* is already invented for us, and prescribed to us in Holy Writ: This our Author hath often already told us, and we have agreed it. The only thing to be premeditated and done, is, 1. To consider what of that *Matter of Prayer*, allow-

ed and directed in the Word, is proper for us, under our Circumstances, at the Time when we Pray. 2. To form Words in our Hearts, by which our Lips shall express the Desires of our Souls. The first is, and will be every good Christian's Work, before he cometh to minister in Prayer, and the Matter may vary every Day, according to the various Contingencies to Persons and Families, occasioned through the Wisdom of him that governeth the World, and the daily Breakings-out of Sin and Corruption, occasioned through that Fountain of Lust in Man's Heart: But yet can never be so well done, (through the unfaithfulness and slipperiness of our Memories) but there will be room left for a *Dabitur in bora*, the Spirit of God, in the very time of our Prayer, to bring to our Minds some Violations of the Divine Law we did not think of, and some Wants which we had forgot.

2. The Second needs no study or deliberation; our Thoughts in a moment form Words, when they are sensible of Wants. The Beggar studieth not for Words to ask for Bread, no more doth the Malefactor for Words to ask for his Life. That Words are a part of perfect Prayer, and of all Prayer, where one ministreth to others in Prayer, must not be denied, and an *essential part* too; for without them he cannot so pray: So as he whose Thoughts are employed in forming of Words, whether to express his own *Premeditations*, or present *Impressions*, or *Monitions*, cannot certainly be denied to have his Thoughts employed about his Work in Prayer.

Our *Casuit* goes on, p. 39. and saith, 'It is pretended, that conceived Prayer is more apt to fix the Minister's Attention in Prayer, because he utters his Words in conceived Prayer, immediately from his Affections, by reason of which, his Thoughts have not that Scope to wander, as when he reads them out of a Book. To which he answereth,

'That if he hath devout Affections, he may utter his Words as immediately from his Affections in a Form, as in a conceived Prayer, and therefore this Pretence is insignificant.

There is no doubt of this, nor do I know who hath made this Pretence: But the Question is, Whether a Man can have the same devout Affections attending a Form of Words composed by another, as he may have attending Words flowing from his own Heart; as a Bullet taken up from the Ground, and thrown by a Man's Hand, is never so hot as one shot out from a Gun, and heated with the Fire there First kindled: So I do think Experience will demonstrate, that no Form of Prayer made without the Man, and taken up into the

the Lips, will so affect the Soul as Words formed within it, and then thrust out of the Lips.

Our *Author*, in the next place, comes to answer the Arguments for conceived Prayers most raising the *Minister's Intention*, that is, of *Affection*, he saith.

They pretend; That in praying by a Form, the *Minister's Affections follow his Words*; whereas, in conceived Prayer, his Words follow his *Affections*. As to this, he saith,

1. That it is a very curious Distinction.

2. That he is not able to apprehend either what Foundation there is for it, or how it is applicable to the Matter.

The Distinction is used both by Dr. *Ames* in his Cases, and by Mr. *Calderwood* in his *Altare Damascenum*; Men both of Learning, Reason and Piety. If our *Casualist* cannot apprehend the Foundation of it, our Charity to them will oblige us not presently to conclude that it hath none; and our Charity to our *Author* obligeth us, if we can, to help his Apprehension.

When our Souls are employed about any Object, it first discovereth that Employment, by Thoughts upon it, which produce the Motions of the Affections according to the apprehended Nature of the Object which the Thoughts are so employed about, if the Object be something to be beg'd or pleaded for, of or from another. The Soul is presently forming Words for the Tongue, in the use of which they shall beg it. Do not the Words here follow the Affections? And are they not thrust out by them as a Bullet is driven out of a Gun by the Powder first fired beneath it, and affecting it.

In praying by *Forms*, it is not possible that the Heart should be suitably affected by any inward Motion of the Soul forming the Words for the Lips, (for they are already formed for them.) So that all the Affection that can possibly attend them, must either be raised, 1. From a serious Premeditation of the Matter of those *Forms*; or, 2. From Post-Thoughts or Reflections upon them when they are uttered. If the latter only, then what is said is true, in the use of *Forms*. The Affections follow the Words, and have no Work either in the forming of them, or sending them forth. As to the former,

It must not be denied, but we may be affected with the Premeditation of the Matter in any Form, as well as an Orator may be affected with the Matter of a Speech, which he is to utter before he uttereth it, though the Speech be made not by himself, but by another. But, I beseech this *Reverend Author* to consider as in the presence of God.

1. Quo-



1. *Quotus quisque est.* How few there are, or are like to be found in the World, who being to Pray only by *Reading Forms*, doth take any considerable Pains with their own Hearts every Time they use them, to affect them præviously, with the Matter of those Forms; which if one doth not, it must be true, that his Affections only follow his Words?

2. Suppose we could find one of many that did so, whether it would be possible for him to raise his Affections to that degree upon such prepared Forms, as when his own Thoughts form the Words which he is to utter?

3. Besides this, it is hardly possibly (to be sure not ordinary) for Men and Women, to be equally affected with *Shame* and *Sorrow*, for past Sins; as for Sins newly, and lately committed, or to be equally intense with Desires, for ordinary and common wants, as for such wants as presently pinch us, and press hard upon us, as to which Forms cannot serve, unless they be renewed every Day; but as to this, we shall have occasion more to speak, when we come to its proper Place. This is enough said, to make the Distinction plain and intelligible.

*But then Secondly* (saith our Author) Suppose it were true, that in conceived Prayer the Words follow the Affections, and in a Form the Affections the Words; how doth it from hence follow, that conceived Prayer doth more intend, and heighten the Affections then Forms? What Reason can there be assign'd, why those Acts of inward Affections, should not be as intense and vigorous as those that go before them?

Suppose, that there can no Reason be given (which yet I think may) yet this follows, that whereas the Grace of Prayer, and the very Life and Soul of it (as our Author somewhere speaketh) lieth much in the Holy Affections that attend it. If the Affections only follow the Words (the Prayer being done, when the Words are once uttered) that Prayer is put up without any such Holy and inflamed Affections. Nor sure is *Shame* and *Sorrow* (two of the Affections mentioned by our Author) so properly Consequents to, as Concomitants of the Act of Prayer.

Our Author goes on, p. 42. *But then Secondly*, it is pretended that the Minister cannot so well express his devout Affections in other Mens Words, as in his own. To which he Answers. That the Ministers business in Publick Prayer, is not to express the degrees and heights of his Affections, or to acquaint God of the particular, and extraordinary fervencies of his own Soul; for in Publick, he prayeth as the Common-  
mouth of the Congregation, and therefore he ought not to express to God

in

in the Name of the People, any matter that is peculiar to himself, &c.

This now is what I cannot possibly understand. To express our particular Affections and fervency is one thing, and to Pray for any particular Matter peculiar to himself is another thing; yet certainly, the first is the Ministers Duty, and the latter his Liberty, if not his Duty also.

Let a Man be praying in Publick, or Private, or Secret, certainly he ought to do it with the most fervent, intense, and raised Affections which he can. Let the Matter of his Prayer be what it will or can, still Affection must be an adjunct to an acceptable Prayer, and the more *intensity*, the more raised, and setting the Soul on Work it is, the better it is, or else St. James was mistaken, James 5. 26.

Nor is it true, that a Minister in Publick Prayer ought to confess no Sins, but what the whole Congregation is guilty of, nor to put up Petitions for any wants, but what are the common wants of the whole Congregation. The common Practice both of the present Church, and the Church in all Ages confuteth this. If this were true, in vain were the desires of any particular Person or Family, in vain their Papers desiring the Prayers of the Minister and Congregation for them, in vain are we in Scripture, commanded to Pray one for another, to make Supplications for all Saints, Eph. 6. 18. If our Brother Sin not unto Death, to Pray for him, 1 John 5. 16. And certainly the Minister hath the same Liberty, and Priviledge that the meanest of the People have. I cannot therefore conceive what our Author means by this, who surely hath a Hundred Times, prayed for some things for particular Persons, and Families which have not been needful for, nor the wants, and desires of all the Persons in the Congregation for themselves, and their Families.

Our Author yet proceeds, and tells us, 'Thirdly and Lastly, It is also pretended, that in the use of Forms, the Ministers Soul is so engaged in directing his Eye to read, that it cannot be so intensely affected with that he prayeth for. In Answer to which he saith, 'He leaveth the Reader to judge, whether the recollecting of the Matter of Prayer, the disposing of it into a due Method, inventing of proper Phrases to express it (neither of which are Acts of Prayer) as (he pretends) he hath shewed before, must not much more basify his Soul, than the directing of his Eye to read.

The Reply is easie. The *Matter of Prayer* is already directed, and needs no inventing, only a considering what is applicable to present Circumstances, which is a work previous to Prayer; the disposing it into a *due Method*, is another imaginary Thing; *Confession*, *Supplication*, and *Thanksgiving*, are the Three Parts of Prayer, which is put before another is nothing material, though every one will without any Study, know it is rational to put *Confession of Sin*, before *Supplication* for Pardon. The *inventing of proper Phrases*, is another thing as imaginary, for they are already *invented*, being Scriptural Phrases or formed with as little Study, as the hungry Begger, need take for Words by which to ask a bit of Bread. But the Souls looking through the Eye upon the Book to see what is there Printed, then recollecting what it sees, and forming the Words first in the Mind, then uttering them by the Lips, is surely a greater Diversion. Besides, that the meditating of the Matter of Prayer, then forming the Words in the Heart, are both of them as proper Acts relating to Prayer, as the *killing the Sacrifice*, the *cleansing of it*, the *laying on the Altar* were Acts relating to the Sacrifice; and therefore lawful, and the Priests Duty, as well as the burning of it, but of this I have before spoken.

Our *Casuis*t proceeds, p. 44. 'It is pretended, That Forms of Prayer deaden Peoples Affections — by a more direct, and immediate Influence, because they still express the Matter of Prayer in the same Words — whereas the very newness, and variety of Words in which conceived Prayers are expressed, doth naturally awaken and entertain their Minds, and keep them more fixed and intent. For Answer whereunto he saith, Let us consider upon what it is that this novelty, and variety of Expression doth keep our Minds so fixed, and intent upon. Is it upon the Matter of Prayer? doubtless no. For that is generally the same, especially the matter of Publick Prayer, and therefore if it were that, fixt our Minds, it would as well do it in the same, as in new and varied Expressions. — But if it be nothing, but the newness of the Phrase, it is expressed in that fixeth their Minds, there is nothing in it, but a meer surprize and amusement of their Fancies, which instead of fixing their Minds doth unfix them, from the internal Acts of Prayer, and divert its Attention from the Devotion to the Oratory of it, &c.

1. To make this Experiment, let the *Author*, comprize the Matter of all Sermons in Six, or Twelve Sermons (which it may be were not impossible) or as some have done in Fifty Two Sermons.

mons, and never Preach no other in Forty or Fifty Years Time to his People, and by that Time he hath preached them five or six Times, ask his People, whether they do generally hear him with that *Attention* and *Intention*, as if he clothed that Matter with new Phrase. I do not believe that one of five Hundred would say so.

2. But Secondly, The Matter of Prayer is principally, *Petitions* or Arguments to inforce those Petitions; admit the *Petitions* or the Matter of them be always the same, are the Arguments also? Doth there any Form comprehend all the Arguments to implead Petitions, which the Scripture warranteth to use, though it commandeth not us to use them all at the same time; nor it may be, are they all so proper for one and the same Time, or for Persons under some Circumstances, as others. So that by our *Authors* leave, there may be new Matter of Prayer to draw out *Attention* and *Intention*.

3. Thirdly, Suppose there were not, doth not the Holy Scripture express the Matter of the same Petitions by different Phrases. Why may we not express it by these Phrases as well as those? And yet Peoples Attention, and Intention be upon the Matter of the Prayer; and if varying of Phrases will help to it, and the Wisdom of the Holy Ghost knowing this hath canonized a variety of Phrase, how any can be restrained the use of that variety which God hath left us? I cannot tell.

4. The gingling, tickling, Oratory of Prayer, is a thing *Nonconformists* abhor, as a puerile, pedantick Thing, not worth any Mans Attention or Intention: But the asking the same Things in other Words, and those such as the Holy Ghost hath taught us in Holy Writ, or such as are proper and expressive, is what deserveth a better Name. *Nonconformists* are a kind of Men, that think that Meat good enough, that is wholesome and nourishing enough; and those Cloaths *fine enough*, that cover enough, and are warm enough, little regarding as to the former; the Turneps cut into several Figures, and laid about the sides of the Dish, nor yet what the Laces, and Fringes of their Cloaths are, or whether they be of the *Spanish* or *French* Fashion. The like Judgment they make too of *Sermons*, and *Prayers*. They judge those Sermons the best that most instruct, and affect the most intelligible, and Scriptural, and those Prayers best, where the Things which God hath given us a Liberty to ask, are most intelligibly and plainly asked, and urged by Arguments, that are most scriptural; but they know the

Holy Scripture hath a variety of Phrases, and all of Equal Authority, and Dignity, equally canonized, and expect that he who is a Teacher should be mighty in the Scriptures, and bring to their Ears and Tastes out of that Store-house, things new, and old, and are apt to think that he that doth it not, hath made but a little entry into that blessed Store-house. That, *de facto*, Novelty in Phrase doth most affect cannot be denied, that it is not sinful, is as evident, and it is as certain, *That the same Matter may more affect in a Novelty of Phrase, then in an old Stile.*

Our Reverend Author cometh in the Last Place, to shew us the Advantage which People have for their Devotion from *Forms*, to which conceived Prayers cannot pretend. He instanceth in Six, from p. 46. to p. 55.

1. The First is, *That People may address themselves to Prayer with greater Preparation.*
2. The Second is, *That in joining with them, the People may Pray with more understanding, then they can well be conceived to do in extemporary Prayer.*
3. A Third is, *That they may join with them, with much more Faith, and Assurance.*
4. A Fourth is, *That they have much less in them to divert the Affections of the People from the Matter of Prayer.*
5. A Fifth is, *That they are more secured, as to the decency, and Solemnity of their Publick Worship.*
6. The Last is, *That in joining with them, the People are more secured of the Reality and Sincerity of their own Devotions.* To all which in General, there are several Things may be said.
  1. That all this is to be said as much for Prayers by a prescribed Form in the Pulpit, as in the Desk; and if there be any thing in these, as to Prayers in the one Place, it holds as strongly as to Prayers in the other. That People may address themselves to join in those Prayers with greater Preparation, and Pray with more Understanding. More Faith, and Assurance, have less to divert them, from the Matter of Prayer, be more secured as to the decency, and order of Publick Worship, and People be more secured of the reality and sincerity of their Devotions: Nay these Arguments will run home to a Mans Family, and hold as strongly there. Nay most of them will ascend up into his Closet after him, three or four of them will hold as strongly there. So as they serve to destroy all *conceived Prayers.*

2. It is an amazing thing, that if these Things were necessary,  
and



and indeed such real Advantages to Peoples Devotion; neither *Solomon*, nor *Moses*, nor *Asa*, nor *Hezekiah*, nor the *Levites* mentioned *Nehemiah* 9. that prayed that long Prayer, should think of this mighty Help to the Peoples Devotion, and give out Copies of their Prayer there mentioned to all the Congregation, that they also might have addressed themselves to God with more Preparation, and have prayed with more Understanding, and with more Faith, and Assurance, and have had their Affections less diverted from the Matter of Prayer, and have had the decency, and solemnity of their Publick Service more secured, and have been more secured of the reality, and sincerity of their Devotions, they were all things as necessary then, as they are now, yet we have no mention of any such thing; but this it seems, is a new discovery, reserved to the later Times, or rather a new device, to uphold the Necessity of Forms.

3. If the Wise God had seen these Things so necessary for so great Ends, we certainly should not have been without an Institution, or at least some Declaration of the Will of God in the Case, but we find nothing of that in any Part of Holy Writ.

4. All these Things will signify nothing, if it prove impossible, that he who ministrereth in Prayer unto others, should by Forms (unless drawn for every Time he ministrereth) confess the Sins, or put up Supplications for the good Things, he ought to confess, or put up Supplications for; but this will fall under our Debate, when we come to consider what our Author hath said to the Fourth Case stated by him.

5. It is not what we fancy, and think we can prove by our Reason to be a more apposite mean for the performance of a Duty that indeed is so: But the mean must have a Divine Institution, if it be not so naturally. A *Papist* will Discourse bravely for the usefulness of a *Crucifix* to be set in our Eye, to put us in Mind of what Christ hath suffered for us, to encourage us to hope in the Mercy of God through him; but yet it is a mean to be abhorred, not used; to speak more particularly to our Authors Six Things.

1. *Nonconformists* know that they are to Pray intelligibly, and not in bumbasted non-intelligible Phrases to the meanest of the People. So as there is no such need of Preparation to understand Words and Phrases, which are ordinarily such as are understood as soon as heard. They detest such kind of Language in Prayer, as Dr. Featly reflects on, where the Minister spake to Christ under the Name of the *Dolphin of Heaven*, such kind of

stuff indeed, had need have Time allowed the Hearers to understand. *Nonconformists* would have all Prayers in such a Phrase as needs no *Companion* to the Temple to expound, which they judge of no great significance, because he is not like to be a *Companion* to one of an Hundred.

2. For the same Reason, they see little in our Authors second pretended Advantage of Forms.

3. There is as little in his Third Thing, for nothing can Advantage *Faith* and *Assurance*, but a Knowledge that the thing ask'd, is what God hath promised to give, which a *Form* will not instruct him in, that doth not otherwise know it; and if he otherwise know it, it is needless as to any such Thing: However I know of none, but alloweth the Use of Forms for *Instruction*, which if Men will Use, they may easily know, by examining Scripture, what God hath willed Men to ask.

4. For the Fourth Thing, Men in praying ought to take Care not only that their Affections be not separated from the Matter of Prayer, but that their Thoughts may not be separated from the Words, by which that Matter is expressed: Nor can I understand, how the Affections should attend the Matter expressed, if the Thoughts be out of the way of expressing, or of Words, by which it is expressed. I am sure, he who prayeth by Forms gives his Thoughts more Liberty to leave both, than he who prayed *de pectore*, by Words formed in his own Breast; whether there be any Soul so pious, that it will not take it? I cannot tell: It is probable, that the Souls of the most Will (I am sure my own would) and if the Thoughts be once separated, the Affections in the Course of Nature will not stay behind.

5. As to the Fifth. If our Author means no more by *Decency*, and *Solemnity*, then *gravity*, and *expressiveness*, and the absence of what usually Men will call *Rudeness*, who understand any thing of Religion, he is a lamentable Minister, that cannot so Pray without a Form, and indeed *aptior ad sivoam*, fitter for some other Employment: If he means delicate Words, Curt, and comprehensive Exprehenensions, it may be such Prayers will be found not wrote after any Scriptural Copy; unless that of the *Lords Prayer*, which we rather judge a *directory* of Matter, than a *Copy of Words*, and hath always been so judged by the Church, extending it in all Practice, and never judging that enough, either for the Desk, or Pulpit.

6. It will pose any to understand how People should, more by Forms than by free Expressions, be secured as to the *reality and sincerity of their Devotions*, considering that to Devotion in Prayer is required not only *Intention and Fervor of Affection*, but *Attention of Thoughts* also; and the latter cannot be without the former, especially if *Forms* give a greater Liberty to the roving of Thoughts, and the Heart of Man be so bad, that not one of many, but will take it.

Thus much come our Author's Six pretended Advantages to Devotion from *Forms of Prayer* to. There are two eminent ones that it must want.

1. One obvious Means to keep the Thoughts of him that prayeth from wandering. And this is true, both as to him that ministrereth in Prayer, and those who only pray, the Thoughts of both have apparently a further Liberty to rove, whether they will take it, or no. Let every one speak from his own Experience, and if they do differ in their Experience, let it be considered whether their natural Temper doth not make the difference; which is not a thing eligible, but natural, and upon that account necessary. If the Ministers Thoughts be not attent, he must speak Nonsense; if the Peoples Thoughts be not, they must say *Amen* to they know not what.

2. A Second Advantage they must want, is the *Confession of renewed Sins*, and begging Pardon of them, the making known of renewing Wants, and giving Thanks for new Mercies, which, whether they ought to be the Matter of *Confession, Petition, or Thanksgiving* in Publick Prayer, will fall under our Consideration in speaking to the next Case.

3. To these two must be added, That those who in Publick pray by Forms, are tied up to those particular Opinions which the Composers of these Forms have, which indeed is not an Evil falls upon the People that do not minister, who may with-hold their *Amen*, but yet by their Presence will appear to do what they indeed do not; but it will fall heavy upon those that minister by them. We have a plentiful Instance of this in the *Popish Missal*, where their Idolatrous Opinions are mixed with their Prayers, viz. That of the *Invocation of Saints*, the *Application of their Merits to us*, as well as their Heretical Opinions of *Purgatory*, and *departed Saints Intercession for us*, and the *Merits of our own Works*: All which indeed are upon the *Reformation* left out of our *Liturgy*, but may be put in again whenever we have Superiors of that Faith. It is true, in conceived

conceived Prayers the People are exposed to the same Danger as to their Ears; but not the Person that ministrETH, and the People have a Power to withhold their *Amen*, and to complain of such as are guilty of such Errors: But there is no complaining of *Forms* by *Publick Authority* confirmed.

Our *Casulist* saith truly, 4. 53. and 56. That *Experience* (the best Judge in this Case) is pleaded on both sides: Some say, they can keep their Thoughts most attent, and their Affections most intense, in praying by *Forms*; others say the quite contrary: But I do not think that our *Reverend Casuist* directeth the best way for reconciling these Experiences, by endeavouring to persuade them, That the Fault must lie in their *Prejudice* or *Temper*: For it may be, the Fault lieth on the other side, in their *customary Practices and Usage*, or a not right understanding their *Duty in Prayer*, but judging; that it only lies in their saying *Amen*, whether their Thoughts be kept attent to the Words and Matter of Prayer, and their Affections intense, yea, or no: If so, the Cure must be wrought on the other side. If our Author, by his many good *Christians*, meaneth many such as have an Ability to express their own and others Wants to God in Prayer, and exercise that Ability in a daily Prayer with their Families, and in their Closets, I do very much doubt whether many such will say so, at least I have not met with many such do say so. If he meaneth others that have not attained to this Ability or Practice, he ought to distinguish between a *metaphysical Goodness* and a *moral Goodness*, and again, betwixt the Degrees of *moral Goodness*. We desire to speak Wisdom to those that are perfect, and to all, to strive after Perfection; forgetting not *either* the things that are behind, and pressing on to those things that are before; and this is that which we wish, even every Soul's spiritual Perfection. This is enough to have spoken to our *Casulist's* Three Cases handled in his First Part; we now proceed to his Second, which begins with this Case:

Case. 3. Whether the common Cases and Wants of *Christians* can be so well expressed in one constant Form, as in a conceived Prayer.

The Author hath a little perplexed this Case, by putting in the Word *Common*, the Question had been well enough without it. Nor hath he sufficiently explain'd what he means by *Common Cases and Wants*; whether he understands it with reference to Time, and by *Common* understands *Constant*; or with reference to Person; in which Sense, Cases and Wants cannot be called *Common*, unless all propound or have them. We cannot therefore well speak

speak to what this *Reverend Author* saith, as to this Case, without putting a previous Question, viz.

Quest. What, and whose Cases, or Wants, the Minister is bound to represent or make known to God in the publick Congregations or Meetings of Christians?

I find our *Author* in part determining this Question, P. 2. p. 2. *Publick Prayers* (saith he) ought not to descend to particular Cases and Necessities, because they are the Prayers of the whole Congregation, and therefore ought to comprehend no more than what is, more or less, every Man's Case and Necessity. I take this to be a false and mistaken Hypothesis, and the Reason given for it, because they are the Prayers of the Congregation, to be utterly insufficient; for surely the whole Congregation is concerned in the true Wants and Welfare of every Member, that they may rejoice with those that rejoice, and weep with them that weep, Rom. 12. 15. otherwise they are not kindly affectionated one to another, according to v. 10. And this is the declared Will of God, Eph. 6. 18. that there should be made Supplications for all Saints, yea, for all Men, 1 Tim. 2. 2. How are these Texts (think we) to be understood, That Supplications should be made for all Saints, so far as their Wants are all the same, and no further? Or, that Prayers should be made for all Men, as to those things that are the Common Wants of all Men, but no further? I would fain see one good Reason for this, or one Text of Scripture to prove it.

It is true, we cannot confess the Sins of particular Persons, unless we know them, nor put up Petitions for a Supply of the Wants of particular Persons, unless we know them; and tho' we do know them, yet some particular Sins or Wants are not fit to be made the Matter of publick Confessions, or publick Petitions: But it is as true, there are a multitude of other Sins, which are not the Sins of all, but of some particular Persons in Congregations, and many other Wants, which likewise are not the Wants of all the Congregation, but of some particular Persons in them, which may well enough be confessed, and Pardon begged for, and which we may well enough beg a Supply of; and these ought to be made the Matter of a publick Prayer, either upon the *Pastor's Knowledge of them*, tho' the Sinner doth not desire them, or upon such Persons Desire. It was in a publick Assembly and Prayer, that Ezra confessed and bewailed the Sins of those that had married strange Wives, Ezra 9. 12, 13, 14. For, v. 4. They were assembled, all them that trembled at the words of the Lord God of Israel; yet that Sin was not



not the common Sin of all the People. *Exra* 10. they are numbered, and it appears they were but 100, *Priests* 17, *Levites* 6, 1 *Singer*, 3 *Porters*, and 73 *Israelites*, (who may be called *Laicks*.) He who consulteth *Exra* 1. will find the whole Number was (*v.* 64.) 42360. besides 7337 *Servants*; the *Priests* alone were above 4000, *v.* 36, 37, 38, 39. and these were but the first Companies came out. So that it seems that excellent Scribe thought, that in *publick Prayers*, *Confession* was to be made of other Sins than what were the Sins of every Individual of the Congregation. More Instances might be given, but this is enough. Besides that, our Saviour's Prayer, upon the Cross was publick enough, *Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do;* yet he knew, that all there present were not guilty of crucifying him. The like might be said of *Stephen's Prayer*, *Acts* 7. 60. So that this new Notion is quite contrary both to the Practice in the *Old Testament* and *New*.

2. Secondly, It must necessarily deprive all private Christians of the Benefit of publick Prayers in all their particular Distresses, whether respecting their outward or inward Man, and leaves them only to Family and Closet-Prayer of their Friends, and to what Prayers they can make for themselves.

3. It is directly contrary to the Apprehension of the Generality of Christians, who have used to send to their Ministers to pray for them in the publick Congregation, and to the Practice both of our Church, and I believe all others.

4. Whofo looks into Scripture, will find, that the Ministers of God never thought it enough, in the Case, to make general Confessions of Sin, or general Requests for good things, or to give Thanks for Mercies in general; but have descended to particular Confessions of the particular Sin regnant, or committed lately, and to particular Petitions for special Mercies, and to particular Mercies in their Thanksgivings.

5. Our Author, *p.* 5. of *P.* 2. hath given us a good Account of such things as are the common Wants of all Persons, and at all Times, *viz.* 1. *Forgiveness of Sin*, *Peace of Conscience*, (*the giving, or preserving of it,*) *the Assistance of Divine Grace*, to deliver us from the Power of Sin and Satan, and make us meet to be Partakers of the Saints in Light; *Redemption from Death and Hell*; *Protection and Success in all our Honest Concerns and Undertakings*; *the Daily Supply of our Bodily Wants and Necessities*; and in general, *the Preservation and Direction of our Governours*; *the Peace and Welfare of our Na-*  
tive

tive Country; the Prosperity of the Church, the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Success of its Ministers in the Work of the Lord.

Our Reader must also remember how much our Author hath reflected upon *conceived Prayers*, for having in them the same things over and over again, Part. 2. p. 17, 18. as contrary to the Order of our Saviour, who expressly forbids us *vain Repetitions*, Matt. 6. 7, 8. Now unless this be only Faulty in conceived Prayers, not in *Forms* also, and we ought in Publick only to pray for things which a whole Congregation (in common) wants, and to confess Sins which a whole Congregation (not some Persons only in it) are guilty of, one *single Collect* is enough. Here are but eleven or twelve Lines made comprehensive of all this; nor must any particular Confession of Sin be made, but only in the *general*, *That we have all sinned, and come short of the Glory of God*; for there are few Sins that every individual Person in a Congregation is guilty of.

6. Supposing that none but the same Sins (and those the Sins of the whole Congregation) ought to be in publick Prayer confessed, and none but the *same good things*, and those such as are the Wants of the whole Congregation, ought to be petitioned for; yet neither are such Sins, nor such Wants, always the same, much less such Mercies as refer to a whole Congregation. God's Mercies to Congregations, as well as Persons, are *new every Morning*: So as the same Forms will not serve.

7. I therefore conclude, That altho' this be the best Argument I know can be brought for the constant Use of a stated *Form of Words* in Prayer, if it could be maintained; yet the *Hypothesis* is in no degree true, and the Argument built upon it must needs be very weak, supposing what is far from Truth. Prayer is the Communion of the Church, wherein the Members of it are not only to confess their joint Sins, but the particular Sins (tho' not all the particular Sins, of which some may not be fit for publick Notice) of each Member, or any Number of Members, and to beg not only a Supply of such things as they all want, but as any Member of their Body, or Number of their Members are guilty of, and known to be so, or stand in need of. This is enough to have spoken to the first thing said by our Author, as to this first Case.

2. He tells us, Secondly, *That such Alterations of the common Cases of Christian Churches, as could not be foreseen, and provided for*

at the first Forming of their Liturgies, may, for the most part, be provided for in new Forms. To which I say,

1. That this proceedeth upon the former Supposition, That no Sins are to be confess'd in publick Prayers, but such as are the common Sins of the Congregation; no good things to be begg'd, but such as all Persons in the Congregation want; no Thanksgivings to be made, but for Mercies affecting the whole Congregation; which is not true, and contrary to all Reason and Practice, as I have already shewed; and therefore I need not here enlarge again on that Discourse. But supposing what I have before proved, That the more notorious and publicly-noticed Sins of any Member, or Number of Members in Congregations; such as Swearing, Cursing, Drunkenness, noted Uncleanneſs, &c. are Matters of publick Confessions, and the Wants of any Member, or Number of Members in a Congregation, known to the Minister and better part of the People, are Matter of publick Petition; and any noted Deliverance or Mercy, bestowed on any Member, or any Number of Members of a Congregation, is also Matter of publick Thanksgiving. These are so frequently renewing, so often varying, that our *Casuiſt* could hardly have said *New Forms* were likely to be made sufficient for them, and proper to them: Especially considering *Publick Forms* are not ordinarily made by the respective Ministers of Congregations, who alone, by watching over his Flock, is like to know its State.

2. Secondly, There may be, and ordinarily is, so great a Variety in the State of particular Congregations, as to Sins, Wants, and Mercies, that it is not reasonable to imagine, that *Forms* enough should be made suited to each Congregation; So as our *Author* must assert, that no Sins ought to be confessed publicly, but the Sins that are common to all *Christians*; no Mercies to be begged, but what all *Christians* need; no Mercies to be given Thanks for, but such as all *Christians* receive, or at least all within the Compass of those Churches to whom those *Forms* are to extend, or his Second Conclusion will not hold.

3. His Third Conclusion is but for a *Quousque*, viz. 'That supposing such Provision for extraordinary Cases cannot be made in the publick Forms, yet that is no Argument why it should not be used so far forth as it comprehendeth the Main of the common Cases of the People.

This indeed is true, against such an Use this Argument doth not conclude; but it doth not follow but some others may.

4. The

4. The last thing our *Author* saith, That the Defect of such new Provision may be supplied by the Minister in a publick Prayer of his own. May, may be here understood as referring to *Naturally* or *Legally*. Of the first, there is no doubt; for the second, our *Author* saith no more, than that our Church allows, or at least permits Ministers so to do. As to this, I have spoken before; and, it may be, if it be inquired into, it will be found, that within these Twenty Years it would neither be allowed nor permitted in some Diocess. Besides that, Permission is the same with *Commivance* or *Indulgence*, which is a very uncertain thing, until it be established by an *Act* of Parliament. Besides that, many Ministers will not allow themselves any such thing; the Reason of which (doubtless) is, because they have at least an Apprehension that no such thing is allowed by the Law: Whether it be, or no, I shall not dispute.

Our *Author* proceedeth to his Fifth Case.

Case 5. *Whether there be any Warrant for Forms of Prayer in Scripture, or pure Antiquity?*

I dare say there is hardly one Dissenter, of any Judgment, that will not readily grant there is; tho' some of them very much doubt, whether there be any Warrant for Forms of Prayer to be universally imposed or used in Prayer. By Warrant, our Learned *Author* saith right, must be meant some *positive Command*, or *allowed Example*. I cannot tell who it is, that hath affirmed, That nothing ought to be used in the Worship of God, but what is commanded by him: Whosoever hath so said, hath spoken crudely and rashly, and himself (if he understand himself) will at the next Breath grant, That *Pulpits* and *Pews*, *Seats* and *Cushions*, and *Habits* of *Cloaths*, (not entailed to Worship only,) and many things more, may be used in the Worship of God, which God hath not particularly and in *Specie* commanded. These things indeed Dissenters will say,

1. That God may be worshipped by no *Act* but what himself hath directed, because no other *Act* can be an *Act* of Obedience to him; and where there is no Obedience, there can be no Homage paid to God: And here both *Conformists* and *Nonconformists* are, I suppose, fully agreed.

2. That no Means by which any *Act* of Worship shall be performed, may be used, which God hath not directed, either by the Light or Law of Nature, or by a positive Institution in his Word. Their Reason is, Because the Law of God extendeth to the Means as well as to the *Act*; nor hath God directed any *Act* of Worship or Homage to

him, but he hath also, either by the *Light* or *Law of Nature*, or by some part of his *Revealed Will*, directed sufficient Means for the Performance of that Act, which every obedient Christian is bound to observe, use, and prefer; particularly as to Prayer, they say, the *Act* is directed both by the *Light of Nature*, (whence it is that the Heathens prayed, and directed *dies Supplicationem* to the Divine Being) and also by Scripture, and his revealed Will, which rectified the *Light of Nature*, and hath taught us, as to the *Object*, that Prayer is to be directed to the *Only True God*; and many things, as to the manner of Performance, *viz.* That it be directed to the Father, in the Name of Christ, and with the Spirit; and for things only, which are according to the revealed Will of God, and under such Limitations as the Scripture hath directed.

3. That even the *Light of Nature*, as well as *Scripture*, hath not only directed Men and Women to pray, but to use *Words in Prayer*: They are the *Calves of our Lips*, the Homage of our Tongues unto God; and whereas Prayer is the *Expression* of our *Wants and Desires* unto him who is able to supply them, tho' God indeed understands the first Motions of our Souls in Desires, yet these without Words are not what the Scripture ordinarily calls *Prayer*, nor what Men have ordinarily called so.

4. That God hath not directed the Words which we should use at all times, (tho' he hath directed some Words and Forms of Words which we may use) but hath left us at Liberty to use what *Words we please*, expressive of the Matter of Prayer directed in Holy Writ; and this could be no otherwise, the same Matter not serving us at all times, and consequently not the same Words.

5. That our Words are (as the Philosopher expresseth it) *2<sup>o</sup> 1<sup>o</sup>*, or *2<sup>o</sup> 2<sup>o</sup>*, *inward and outward*. Our internal Words are our Thoughts, (our Hearts being our Shops, wherein the Words of our Lips are first forged or formed: *Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*, (saith our Saviour.) *While I was musing*, (saith David, *Psal.* 39. 3.) *the fire burned, then spake I with my tongue*.)

6. That as we best know our own Wants, so our own Hearts can best form Words, by which our Lips shall express and utter them: So as the *forming of Words* expressive of our own Wants and Desires, in our own Hearts, is the most natural and proper Means of Prayer, and *Divine*, because most Natural, and not restrained by any part of the Divine Rule.

7. Lastly,



7. Lastly, They think that nothing but a plain Divine Revelation of the Will of God, as to the use of another Mean, can excuse them from the use of a Mean that is *proper* and *most natural* for the End: So as they think there must be something in Scripture, either in a Command, or something which hath the Force of a Command, (as universal Example hath) which must justify their ordinary use of Forms of Words, not first formed in their own Hearts, to express their Wants and Desires to God in Prayer. This is all, I think, that Dissenters will say in this Case. Let us now hear what our *Reverend Casuist* opposeth to this: He will prove, as he tells us *P. 2. p. 6.*

1. ' That supposing this were true, yet it doth not conclude ' against Forms.

2. ' That supposing it did conclude against the Use of Forms, it ' equally concludes against conceived Prayer.

As to the First, he saith,

1. ' That they do not pretend that God hath any where com- ' manded us to pray by Forms, and no otherwise.

So that then publick praying by Forms is not the only instituted publick Prayer.

2. ' Nor, Secondly, do they pretend, that all the Prayers we ' at any time offer unto him, should be first composed into a ' Form.

Then some conceived, free Prayer in Publick is our Duty, or at least lawful.

But this our *Casuist* pleadeth for, ' That God hath enjoined ' some Forms to be used and offered up in Prayer: Tho' together ' with those Forms, we grant there might be, and doubtless were, ' other Prayers to be offered up unto him. This he proves, *p. 7.* and to *p. 19.* of the *Second Part.* He instanceth in the Form of Blessing, mentioned *Numb. 6. 23, 24, 25, 26.* the Directions for Prayer, forthe Expiation of Murther, *Deut. 21. 17, 18.* and for the Prayer to be used at their Payment of their Third Year's Tythe, the Prayers mentioned in the *Psalms*, delivered to *Asaph*, *1 Chron. 16. 7.* used in *Hezekiah's* Time, *2 Chron. 29. 30.* and by *Ezra*, *chap. 3. 10, 11.* and the *Lord's Prayer*, upon which he enlargeth from *p. 81* to *p. 19.*

To all which so much hath been already said, that nothing need be added. See Mr. *Cotton* about the *Lawfulness of Set Forms*; the *Reasonable Account*, and *Supplement*, &c. But all these are indeed no Proof. The Reason is,

Because

Because, what was lawful for God himself, and Christ, and Holy Men inspired by God; by a Prophetical Spirit, and imploied by him (as *David* was to set his Temple-service in Order) 2 *Chron.* 28, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. must not be concluded lawful for others, and what might be lawfully complied with upon such Direction; and indeed Divine Institution, must not be concluded lawful to be complied with upon no such Direction or Divine Institution. The Three first Instances produced by our *Author*, are *Forms* instituted by God immediately; the other by *David* imploied by God, and made by his Spirit to understand his Will, and the Pattern of his *Temple-service*. The Last by *Christ* himself, sent to erect a new way of Worship.

Not therefore to enter into any further Disputes. 1. Whether *Christ* intended the *Lords Prayer*, for a Form of Words, or only a Direction for Matter, if as a Form of Words, it doth not agree with it self, *Matth.* 6. *Luke* 11. the Words differ much in those Two Places; whether for a constant Use, or temporary Use are Things, many Words have been spent about, and I see no help; but Men must opine as they please in the Case. Our *Author* thinks, that only *Luke* 11. it was prescribed as a *Form of Words*, and truly it is probable. (if it were at all so prescribed) but then those Words. *For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory for ever, Amen.* are no part of the *Lords Prayer*, for they are not in *Luke* at all, but I say all this signifieth nothing; for, from *Christ*, or the *Apostles Acts*, is no Conclusion to justify other Mens *Acts*, without other Warrant of Precept, &c. and to this Answer to these Instances our *Author* cometh, p. 19. for what he saith of the *Lords Prayer*, let Men judge as they please; I know no sober *Dissenter*, but will say it is their Duty to make the Matter of that Prayer, the Matter of their Prayers; and that they may use the Phrase, or entire Form (if they understand it) as well as other Words of Scripture. And if our Brethren judged that we should use that, and none else; we should have no other *Liturgy* for the Desk, nor other Prayers in the Pulpit. The Difference therefore about that, is not worth mentioning, and a Dispute about spelling *this* or *thys*.

That which we insist upon, is, that though *Christ* had Authority to prescribe a Form, yet none else hath any.

Our *Author* saith very true, p. 13.

1. That this Answer allows the prescribing Forms of Prayer to have in them no intrinsic Evil, no contrariety to the Eternal Rules and dictates of right Reason.

2. That

2. That the prescribing of Forms (under the New Testament) is good and useful. This is expressed too indefinitely. For nothing will follow, but only, That Christ's prescribing a Form was good and useful; if we extend it further, it must be upon this Principle, That others have the same Authority, to direct means of Worship that Christ had. Now this will ask a great many Words to prove. Christ had undoubted Authority to institute Acts, and Means of Worship for and in his Church? But how doth it appear that others have? His very Apostles commissioned by him to settle the first Gospel Churches, neither claimed nor practised any such Power.

3. Thirdly, He saith. *This Answer must also allow, that God's prescribing Forms of Prayer by inspired Persons (by his Son, he should have said, for we under the Gospel, find no Forms of Publick Prayer prescribed by other inspired Persons)* is so far forth a warrant for our Imitation, as the thing it self is good, useful, and imitable by us. If God doth such, or such a Thing, because it is good, and useful to some End; that is sufficient warrant for us to do the same, provided we have the same Reason, for to imitate God, is our Duty, &c.

Here now is a great Fallacy. Forms of Prayer in themselves are neither Good, nor Evil; God, or Christ have not prescribed us any Forms, because they are good and useful; but because he hath prescribed them, therefore they are good; and tis our Duty to use them (if such a Prescription can be proved) as Forms, or the prescribing Forms, hath in it, or them no intrinsic Evil; so neither hath it any intrinsic Goodness, or suitableness to the Eternal Dictates, or Rules of right Reason (as our Author expounded it, p. 19.) It is very true, we are bound to imitate God in any thing which he hath done, because it is good and useful, but not in such things, which are made good only by his Command and Institution. God instituted Acts of Worship, which but for his institution had had no goodness in them: Such were Sacrifices under the Old Testament. The Two Sacraments under the New, he directed Forms as means for the Celebration of both Sacraments. Will it therefore follow, that we may imitate God, in making New Sacraments, and New Forms.

But (saith our Author) Our Governours have the same Reason that God had, viz. because they are useful. What Christ's Reason was we cannot inquire, so far as the Evangelist acquaints us with it, it was to gratifie the Disciples, desiring him to teach them to pray, Luke 11. 1. Indeed it is probable, that our Saviour would not

not have gratified them, if he had not known it had been useful for them. But he never imposed upon them, either never to use any other Words in Prayer; nor yet always to use these. Nor doth our Saviours Direction refer more to the Church, than to the *Family*, and the *Closet*; besides, what might be useful for some, and at some times, might not be useful for all, and at all Times.

2. Our Reverend Author, p. 25. comes to his Second Thing promised, viz. to shew, *That supposing it were true, that nothing were to be admitted in the Worship of God, but what hath a Divine Institution; it equally concludes against conceived Prayer, as against Forms.* His Answer is, *because God hath no where instituted conceived Prayer, i. e. That Men in Prayer should Pray by Words first formed in their own Hearts.* We need no *Institution* for what Nature it self dictateth in any religious Act. All Institution of that Nature must be *corrective*, not *directive*. *Institution* indeed, often correcteth our corrupt and imperfect Nature; and so it is in this business of Prayer. God hath commanded us to Pray. It is Written in the Law of Nature, that there is a God, that this Supreme Being, being the first Cause, and the first Mover, must be the Author of all Good. Hence it directs us *Prayer* for the good Things we want, and *Praise* for good Things received. Prayer is a making known of our wants to God. God hath given us Sense and Reason to tell us what those wants are, a Power to Will, and desire a supply of them, to form Words to be uttered by our Lips as expressive of them, to help us to the better Knowledge of our wants, he hath given us his Word; if in that, he hath given us any Forms of Words to be ordinarily used in that Duty, we are to use them. Others he hath left at Liberty, under the more general Laws, and Directions of his Word: What need any *Institution* of what Nature it self directeth and teacheth? We have indeed Reason to look for an *Institution*, if we will correct this *natural Course* of Mans Soul, of expressing its desires by Words formed in our own Thoughts; we have Reason to look for a *superfedeas* from a Divine Institution, any *Forms instituted* by God himself, make up such an Institution, corrective of the natural Motions and Inclinations of our Souls. Which is a sufficient Answer to what our Author saith, p. 25, 26. I cannot apprehend what can be called *Vocal Prayer*, but what is such from a *natural Course and Order*, or from a *Divine Institution*. Scriptural Forms (if given and enjoined for ordinary Use) are doubtless so by Di-

vine

*vine Institution*, what can be so in a natural Course or Order, but those which we call free, and conceived Prayers I am yet to learn. For what our *Author* saith of the *Jews* use of Forms, it hath been abundantly spoken too. Particularly, in the *Answer* to Dr. *Falkner's Vindication of Liturgies*, p. 232, 233, 234. Chronologers Account that the *Jews* were carried into the Captivity of *Babylon* about the Year of the World, 3350. and came out thence about the Year, 3420. after 3630. we have little Account of them, they being in a miserable distracted State; till *Pompey* conquered them about 3888. and in like manner under the *Romans*, to the coming of Christ about the Year of the World, 3947; how they were in Christ's Time, the *Gospels*, and *Acts of the Apostles* tells us. About the sixty fifth Year of Christ, they were utterly destroyed. *Philo* is by Chronologers computed to have lived about Twenty five Years before the final Ruine of *Hierusalem*; but our *Author* quotes him proving nothing, but that the *Priests* were want to offer *Prayers* with their Sacrifices, so they might, and yet use no *Forms*. For the *Samaritane Chronicle*, which p. 27. he tells us of, which mentions a Book wrote in the Year of the World, 4713. which contained the Songs, and Prayers also used before the Sacrifices. Those who will give it any Credit may, but the Year of the World, 4713. was 760. and odd Years after Christ, (that was the pretended Time for its first Appearance to the World) for it could not be Printed till above 1500. Years after Christ; and this Book must give an Account of the Affairs of the *Jewish* Church before the Year 3360. which was more than a Thousand Years, before that (for who will regard what the *Jews* did, after they came under the Power first of the *Grecians*, then of the *Romans*.) I Appeal now to any reasonable Man, who will give Credit to any Manuscript, that (wrote more than a Thousand Years after) should pretend to give us Account of what was done in *Ezra's* Time, or before the *Jews* were Captivated by the *Grecians* and *Romans* (for admit the *Jews* when Tributaries to the *Grecians*, or *Romans* did use Forms, it is no imitable President) especially when the *New Testament* gives us the Story of the Church at least Seventy Years of the Time, and saith nothing of it. For our *Authors* Quotation out of *Josephus* about the *Essenes*, besides, that it signifies little, what a Particular Sect did, and a Sect that sprang up too after Christ's Time, of which the Scripture saith nothing. I say besides this, if our *Author* knoweth how to translate *αὐτοὶ τὰς ἐυχὰς*, better than certain *Prayers*, which



which they received from their Ancestors, the Translator of *Josephus* into *English* will help him, who translates it, *They made certain Vows and Prayers, after the Custom of their Country*; which they might do without Forms.

I am not of our Author's Mind, 'That there was not a more urgent Occasion for an exprefs Prohibition of any Rite or Usage of the *Jewish Church* than praying by a Form: For I believe there was no Reason for it at all, because there was no such thing in use; and if there had been any such Rite, I know no Reason why either *John the Baptist* should teach his Disciples to pray; or why Christ's Disciples should beg of him to prescribe them a Form: It should seem they had Forms enough.

Our Author, in the next place, *P. 2. p. 29, 30, &c.* comes to answer those Places of Scripture which Dissenters produce to prove it their Duty to pray free and conceived Prayers.

The first he instanceth in *p. 29. Zech. 12. 20. I will pour out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Hierusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplications.* I shall say little as to what our Author speaketh as to this Text, because I am not concerned in other Mens forming the Argument from it. The *Spirit of Grace and Supplications* signifieth either our own Spirit, and then the Promise concerneth the fuller Effusion of the Spirit of Grace under the Gospel, giving unto God's People generally more Gifts for his Service, especially for Prayer; or else it must be understood of the Spirit of God, which is called the *Spirit of Supplications*, because it particularly helpeth our Infirmities in that Duty. Now whether this Infirmary respecteth only our Affections, or our Memory and Understanding, bringing to our Remembrance Matters contained in Holy Writ, according to the Promise, *John 14. 26.* is the Question betwixt us and our Casuist. Let it be interpreted which way it will, it is all one to us. If of the Third Person in the Trinity, we say he ought not to be shut out, we must give him a Liberty so to bring to our Remembrance; and thus this Text is reducible to the first Case propounded by our Author. Or let it be interpreted as to the Spirit of a Man, under the Gospel renewed and sanctified, so it relates to our Author's Second Case; and enough hath been spoken to each of them. We ought not so to pray (if we be able to do otherwise) as to exclude the former; nor yet so as to omit our own Gift, which is the Effect of the Spirit, which is all we contend for: For all that our Author saith about the Word in the Hebrew used תחנונים whether it sometimes signifie Prayer in the

the general, signifieth nothing as to the Argument, especially considering, that if by the Terms of *Praying* and *Prayer*, &c. be thrice in Scripture signified meerly mental *Prayer*, yet *vocal Prayer* is for those three times forty times understood; and I believe it is not capable of Proof, that meerly *mental Prayer* is thrice called *Prayer*.

For his next Texts, 1 Cor. 1. 5. 2 Cor. 8. 7. I know of none that hath pleaded, that the Gift of *Utterance* is to be restrained to *Prayer*; for my own part, I always thought it respected *Preaching* as well as *Prayer*; but that it is to be understood and limited to extraordinary Gifts, is what I cannot yield: For what is the Gift of *Utterance*, but an *Ability to utter*? which certainly is applicable as well to the *utterance* of our Minds to God in *Prayer*, as of God's Mind to us, in the interpreting or applying of God's Will to us; and let our *Author* prove the contrary, if he can.

These extraordinary Gifts were certainly not so common as that of *Utterance*, which seems to have been the Portion of the whole Church of Corinth, 1 Cor. 1. 5. And by 2 Cor. 8. 7. it appeareth no more extraordinary than *Faith*, *Knowledge*, and *Diligence*, with which it is ranked there; and if *Utterance* be no more than *Ability to utter*, or a *Freedom of Speech*, it is demonstrable that it was not (as our Author saith) peculiar to the primitive Ages of miraculous Gifts; because we find by Experience, that Multitudes have it now, and that both as to *Prayer* and *Preaching*. *Utterance* is expressed by *ῥητοριὰ*, 1 Cor. 1. 5. Eph. 6. 19. Col. 4. 3. or *ῥητορικὴ χάρις*: Now Speech, or a Freedom of Speech, was no extraordinary miraculous Gift. Acts 2. 4. (quoted by our Author) is thus, *They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them; and they began to utter or speak*. It is also used v. 14. and Acts 26. 25. *I speak the words of truth and soberness*, for which Paul needed no extraordinary Gift. By this Reply, the Insufficiency of our Author's Answer to these Scriptures, produced by Dissenters, will appear.

But, p. 33. he goeth on, and saith,

'But they object further, That supposing God hath not given to all Christians the Gift of Prayer, extempore, yet to a great many he hath; and therefore these, at least, he requires to pray by their Gifts, not by a Form, 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 6. 1 Pet. 4. 20. Rom. 12. 6.

It is very true, that some Dissenters have quoted these Texts, and see no Reason yet to quit them, tho' they at first granted them *ex abundanti*, not as needing them to prove what is all that

they do prove; for even *Nature* it self teacheth Men and Women (being able to do it) to expresse the Wants and Desires of their Souls by Words formed in their own Hearts, and tells us no Words are so natural and proper; and what *Nature* teacheth, we need no *Institution* for. If any *corrective Institution* hath restrained us in the use of what is a *natural, proper Means* to an Action, it must be produced. The *Jews* needed no positive Law, requiring them to eat Flesh; but it being the Will of God, that, to shew their Obedience to him, they should forbear eating some kinds of Flesh, there was need of an *Institution corrective* of what *Nature* otherwise taught them. But yet what *Nature* it self teacheth, may also be taught by *Revelation*, as we have always thought this was, by the Texts quoted, which have not been brought to prove, in *Specie*, That those who have the *Gift of Prayer*, ought to use it; But that those who had any *Gift*, serving them to the Performance of a *Religious Act*, ought to use it in the Performance of that *Act*, unless they be restrained by some *corrective Institution*, that is, by some Law of God, declaring his Will for their Forbearance of the use of that Ability, which the Declaration of his Will, in his Word, for the use of this or that Form of Words in Prayer we confess is. This is the general Summ of what hath been said.

All that our *Author* saith, as to these Texts, is, That by *Gifts* in those Texts is only to be meant *Office*. What hath been said to this, may be read in the *Answer to Dr. Falkner's Vindication of Liturgies*, p. 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68. Nothing of which our *Author* takes notice off.

1. It is *gratis dictum* said, and not proved, that *χαρίσματα* signifies in three Texts, *Office*, not *Gift*, it being manifest, that in many Texts it signifies *Gift*, not *Office*. *Erasmus*, in all those Texts, translates it *Donum*, the Gift. Dr. Fulk, against *Martin*, saith, it is never taken in Scripture but for a free Gift; or a Gift of his Grace. The *Vulgar Latin* so translates it. *Erasmus* notes, that *Ambrose* so understood it.

2. *Rom. 12. 6.* saith, *Having then Gifts, differing according to the Grace given to us*; *χαρίσματα ἕκαστῳ κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ διαφορῶς*. It may be, it is the only Text where *χαρίσματα* can with any Pretence be translated *Offices*, and not necessarily there. See *Rom. 5. 15. chap. 6. 23. Rom. 2. 11. 1 Cor. 12. 4, 9, 28, 30. chap. 11. 7. Rom. 11. 29. 1 Cor. 1. 11. 1 Cor. 12. 31.* I think it is hardly used in any other Texts, and in no *Heathen Author*: So as we must have the Sense

Sense of it from Holy Writ. Let any one peruse those Texts, and judge whether, contrary to the Sense of most Authors, he can translate *ἁγίασμα*, Office, or Dignity.

For what our Author saith, as to 1 Tim. 4. 14. that the next Words [*which was given thee by Prophecy*] make it plain, that this is the Sense of it (the Reader may see in the aforementioned Answer to Dr. Falkner, p. 63. what is said to it) That is *obscurum per obscurius*. Piscator, Vatablus, and Beza, make the Sense, That thou mayest Prophecy. Three ancient Versions, viz. the Syriack, Arabick, and Ethiopick, read it, with Prophecy. Our Translators indeed, and Vulgar Latin, read it, by Prophecy. The Greek Particle, *διὰ*, is translated with great Variety, per, propter, præ, ob, post, cum, quoniam; which gives Interpreters such a Liberty. Because of, or for Prophecy, is a very good Interpretation, and justifiable from Matth. 10. 22. and chap. 13. 21, 58.

But (saith our Author, p. 37.) suppose that *ἁγίασμα* doth signify Abilities, not Offices, yet they must be exercised so far forth only as is consistent for Edification.

That is granted; but it is not granted, that our Author hath proved Part 1. Case 3. (as he saith) That the Use of Forms is more for Edification. Let the Reader judge what hath been said in, and replied to that Case.

Our Author comes, p. 39. to his last Task, to prove a Warrant in pure Antiquity for the Use of Forms; and here, first, he will answer what is objected to the contrary, which, he saith, are but two or three doubtful Authorities.

There needed not so many; for the Proof lieth upon the Answerer's Part, surely: It is much to find two or three Authorities to prove a Negative; but neither are they so blind and doubtful as our Author would make them: That *ἡν δύνανται* signifieth with all our might, rather than as we are able; that *sine monitore* signifieth, without a Mummer, or a Custos, or a Corrector; that *communis* signifieth an agreeing in Rites, rather than agreeing in Words, or Phrases, are things impossible to be proved, and therefore vainly attempted. We lay no Stress upon these, but look upon them as very good probable Proofs, which may be, I hope, allowed, where Demonstration is impossible. See what is said as to these Quotations, in the Supplement to the Reasonable Account, p. 19, 20. Let us rather see how our Author proveth, That pure Antiquity did impose any such Forms. The Author of the Answer to Dr. Falkner, makes it appear, p. 209, 210. That it is a thing not capable

capable of Proof, and p. 107. That if it could be proved, it signifies nothing; the Practice of Men being no Argument to prove any thing lawful or unlawful. But yet, let us consider what our Casuist saith; for we do indeed believe that there can be no Proof brought from Antiquity for near Six hundred Years after Christ.

To prove,

1. That Publick Prayers were made within that time. Or,
2. That the Lord's Prayer was frequently used in the Publick Congregation and Worship.
3. Or, That there were Rules and Orders made for Churches meeting together for Prayers, in certain Places, and at certain Times.
4. Or, That many good Men, did from the first, compose Forms of Words for the Instruction of the Weaker, in the due Method, and Matter of Prayer, which some weaker People might arbitrarily use, or let alone. Is to prove nothing denied.

That which is to be proved. That in the Times of purer Antiquity, there were Forms of Prayer composed by the Governours of the Church, and universally imposed on Ministers, even upon those who had the Gift of Prayer, and that the Christian People and Ministers, did universally comply with such Use. Which (as was said before) is so far from having been by any proved, that it is impossible to be proved, for more then Three Hundred Years after Christ, which were the Times of purest Antiquity.

Nor (to give our Reverend Author his due) doth he say more than it seemeth most probable, p. 46. Now probable Things may appear to others not probable, for otherwise they would commence into Demonstrations. But let us examine upon what Grounds he saith, it is most probable, highly probable: His first Ground is, Because so far as we can find, there never was any Dispute amongst Christians, concerning the lawfulness of Praying by Forms. Nor is there now, for those who are not able to pray without it, or who make Use of a Form of Divine Prescription.

2. How should there be, or what need was there of any Dispute about it, till it came to be universally imposed?

3. Who so knows how little Record we have that gives us Account of the Church for the first Three Hundred Years, and by what Hands that little cometh to us, will see no Reason to wonder at our having nothing on this Argument, Immemorial Usage, proves nothing in Divine Worship. But he cometh in the next Place to Matter of Fact.



1. He instanceth first in the Three Ancient Liturgies of *Peter, Mark and James*, which though (he saith) they have been all of them corrupted, yet are doubtless, as to the purer Part of them of great Antiquity, and probably even from the Apostolical Age. There is enough said, as to this in my Lord of Morneyes Book de missa, Cap. 2. And in the Reasonable Account, p. 66, 67.

It is enough to say, That it is not a Thing conceivable, that if *Mark*, or *Peter*, or *James*, or *Andrew*, or any other Apostle had left any such Liturgies, that either *Basil*, or *Chrysostome*, 300, or 310 Years after, should (as is pretended) go to make new ones: Nor that, if either they, or *Basil*, or *Chrysostome*, had made any, then known or taken Notice of in the World; that ever the Council of *Melenis* (as is pretended) should direct the making any for their Province, and not only injoin the Use of them: Nor considering, that *Peter*, *James*, *Andrew*, and *Peter*, and *Mark*, were all Apostolical, and inspired Men, would the Use of any other than theirs have been lawful.

So Cap. 6. Liturgias has omnes falsi postulo, (saith the Learned Morney.)

2. For our Authors Second Proof, p. 49. about the Forms of Questions in Baptism, it is quite another Thing; And those who doubt of the lawfulness of Forms of Prayer, to be universally and publicly used, never doubted of the lawfulness of a Form of sound Words, containing Matter of Doctrine.

3. In all that our Author further saith upon this Argument. I find nothing of Moment insisted on, but what Dr. *Falkner* hath said, either in his *Libertas Ecclesiastica*, or in his *Vindication of Liturgies*, and hath been largely answered, in the Reasonable Account, p. 66, 67. Or, in the Supplement to it. (wrote wholly upon this Argument) Or in the Answer to Dr. *Falkner's Vindication of Liturgies*, Cap. 3. Or in the Postscript to that Answer, containing the Review of that Chapter. There the Reader will find a full Answer to what is here said about the Councils of *Laodicea*, and *Milenis*, to his Argument from *ἐνχαρίσταις* *οὐρανίου* and *ἐπίσκοποι*, and *νομοι*, his *ἐνχαρίσταις* *ἐν μίση*, *Constantine's* Forms. I shall not take the Pains to Write, what is already written so plentifully on this Argument, till I see something said to take off what hath been already said.

4. Our Author saith true, that after the Year Six Hundred, when *Gregory* was come to be Pope, or rather after the Year Eight Hundred, when *Charles the Great* had by his Civil Authority

ty enforced the Use of *Gregory's Liturgies by Fire, and Sword*. No other Prayers were admitted into the Publick Worship, of what was then the *Popish Church*, but what was in the *Established Liturgy*; But what they did then in the *Wilderness* of the *Vallies of Piedmont*, and *Lucerne*, or other Places where the true Church fled, we do not so well know; but never read of any *Liturgy* they carried along with them, or used.

5. For what our *Author* further saith, about the *Calvinistical* and *Lutherane Churches*, there is enough said in the aforementioned Books to Answer it. It lies upon him to prove, that the Churches in *France* and *Holland* generally impose the Use of Forms in all Parts of Publick Worship. If any do voluntarily Use any *Forms* which are prescribed, and left to a free Use, we have nothing to do to Condemn them; though we be of another Mind. I have indeed heard, That in the *Administration of the Sacraments*, and *Marriages*, The *Ministers of the Reformed Churches in France*, and *Holland* generally, keep to *Forms*. *Marrying* Persons is no Ministerial Act by any Institution of Christ. It is a great and weighty Action, and possibly what is fittest to be done by such whose Office it is to *Exhort*, and to *Pray for People*. As for the *Sacraments*, the Ministration of them is indeed a *Ministerial Act*. If we cannot satisfy our selves, in that Ministration by tying our selves to prescribed Forms. We hope, it is not a Thing of that Nature, but we may without any great Danger differ in it from Persons and Churches which we Honour. In the mean Time, the Churches of *Scotland*, and *New England* have hitherto been of our Minds, so that we are not wholly alone; we differ from the *Lutherane Churches* in far greater Things than this, and further yet from the *Popish Synagogues*. But as I have often said, admit all here said as to Antiquity or Practice of other Churches were true (which manifestly is not) it were but a *presumptive*, no concluding Argument. In the mean time,

1. We (many of us as we have said, and it hath appear'd by our Practice, do not judge it sinful, though we do not judge it under all Circumstances eligible) to join by Communion in Prayer with Ministers who use the prescribed Forms, or any other, whose Matter is not sinful, to be assented to, or begg'd of God. So that all our Question is about the Ministerial Use.

2. Nor as to that, do we judge our selves so infallible, as to condemn any Ministers, that are satisfied, so to perform their Publick Ministerial Acts in Prayer. We only say, we cannot, and offer our Reasons in Vindication of our selves. For

For what our Author saith, p. 59, 60. about *Jesuits*, and *Romish Preists*, introducing conceived Prayers, into Publick Use; we hope enough hath been said in our first Chapter to make him alter his Mind. Indeed *Forms of Prayer* were of general Use in the *Popish Worship*, many Hundred Years before there was a *Jesuite* in the World. But we do not believe them so much as *Canonically* enjoined before *Pope Gregories* Time, but first by him. Nor universally practised till *Charles the Great's* Time, which was Eight Hundred Years after Christ. Nor do we see the least Colour of Proof for any such Thing.

Our Author thinks fit to propound, but to speak very little to a *Sixth Case*, viz.

*Case 6. Whether it be lawful to comply with the Use of Publick Forms, when they are imposed.*

Our Author I hope means Publick Forms, containing no Matter, but what God hath given us leave to pray for. 2. *With a Liberty also to Use others in the Pulpit* (for I observe our Author hath all along pleaded for that) This supposed,

The Term *complying*, referreth to *Ministerial Use*, or to a *Popular Use*, whose Work is only to say *Amen* in Heart and with Faith, and due Affection, desiring those Things of God. As to the latter it is not in Question betwixt us. We are so far agreed. That such Use (though possibly under all Circumstances not eligible) yet is not sinful.

So as the only Question is of *Ministerial Use*. This our Author knows many of us Judge not lawful, we have given him our Reasons. Our Author hath pretended to Answer them. We have now shewed him, that his Answers appear to us insufficient, and bottomed upon Mistakes. So as yet *sub judice lis est*, and the Question is not (as our Author States it.) *Whether a lawful thing when imposed, may be lawfully complied with.* But whether what some Persons judge lawful, may be done by others, who verily believe it unlawful.

Yet were the Question (as our Author stateth it) *Whether a Thing [in the Worship of God] lawful [that is apparently, neither commanded nor forbidden in Gods Word] may be lawfully complied with, if commanded by Men.* It could not be determined affirmatively without determining.

That it is in the Power of Man to determine Things in Gods Worship, which he hath left to Peoples Liberty; and consequently, when God had given his People a Liberty; for a Peace Offering to offer of the *Herd*, or of the *Flock*, either *Male*, or *Female*, Lev. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Or a *Goat*. It was yet lawful for *Asa*, or *Jebosaphat*, or *Hezekiab*, or *Josiah*, or the *Jewish Sanhedrim* to have by an Humane Law restrained them to offer none but *Bullocks*, or *Sheep*, or *Goats*, or of them none but *Males*, or none but *Females*, which as we read not was ever attempted; so the lawfulness of such a *Restriction*, or *Compliance* with it may deserve serious Thoughts. For what our *Author* saith, That if the *Imposition of Prayer in Publick by Forms* may not be lawfully complied with, then neither may the *Imposition of Prayer* ex tempore. We say, who asketh any such Thing? For my own Part, I think it would be unreasonable, surely those who plead for Liberty in this Thing, cannot Plead for *Imposition* any way; and therefore what our *Author* saith here, seemeth to me wholly *Impertinent*.

---

**F I N I S.**

---